

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 11, 1989

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BONIOR].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 11, 1989.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAVID E. BONIOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

May the gift of memory, O gracious God, ever be with us, and cause us to be grateful for the people who have gone before and on whose values and strengths we continue to build. Though we are aware of our own responsibilities, yet we know deep in our hearts that our efforts and deeds have been guided and blessed by parents and grandparents, by traditions of family and friends and colleagues. For all those whose lives and love have been our blessing, we offer these words of gratitude and thanksgiving. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] to lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TORRES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution authorizing the 1989 Law Enforcement Torch Run for Special Olympics to be run through the Capitol Grounds.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution authorizing a first strike ceremony at the United States Capitol for the Bicentennial of the Congress Commemorative Coin.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) entitled "Joint resolution designating the week beginning May 14, 1989, and the week beginning May 13, 1990, as 'National Osteoporosis Prevention Week'."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Representatives of May 4, 1989, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair to receive the former Members of Congress.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR) presiding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the Chair and the Chamber, I consider it a high honor and distinct personal privilege to have the opportunity of welcoming so many of our former Members and colleagues as many may be present here on this occasion. We all pause to welcome them.

The Chair, at this time, recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Speaker and the majority leader and majority whip are currently at the White House. Save for that single event they would be here. They would be here to welcome and recognize many who have been mentors of those present Members of Congress, many who have made historical contributions to the welfare of this democracy, many who have enhanced both this institution and our democracy. The Speaker would want me to say a special personal thanks for this day to the many Members with whom he

served, with whom he labored to uplift the quality of life in this country.

Those Members who currently serve know that we do so as legatees of your prior service as legatees of the commitment and talent and knowledge that Members brought to the ever-expanding experiment in free government, in the creation of a just though yet imperfect society, but one that we believe is more perfect than any other yet tried by man, and one which these former Members, Mr. Speaker, individually and collectively, have enhanced. Indeed, we are pleased to again greet these Members.

There have only been, I think, approximately 11,000 persons who have been granted the privilege by their fellow citizens of serving in this body. As we are so proud to point out, there is only one way to get to the House of Representatives, unlike the U.S. Senate, unlike the Maryland State Senate which I serve and the House of Delegates in Maryland, most probably of the State legislators, only one way, and that is to be given the very high honor of having the faith and trust of our neighbors placed in Members, to speak for them and to serve them in this great democracy.

So to each and every one of the former Members, for those who now serve, we thank everyone.

I see my friend John Rousselot up here. I remember when I came to the Congress as perhaps some other Members did with an image of a Member because of his or her reputation. I came to the Congress, and I have told this to John not believing that John perhaps was the best guy that I was going to be a friend with in the Congress. He and I did not agree on all the issues, but in a very short period of time we became friends and I came to respect his commitment to his constituency and to his country. I think that is what happens with most Members. We differ on the issues. We have a different perspective, we represent different constituencies, but the overwhelming majority of Members with whom we have served, present and past, are Members who have a deep and abiding commitment to serving their constituency honestly and effectively. We ought to take pride in that. The former Members, I think, are probably concerned, as am I, Mr. Speaker, and as many Members of this body are now concerned, with the House of Representatives. It is important that the people of America have a respect and a confidence in the Con-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

gress. It is my own personal view that that confidence is currently and has been warranted, merited, by the quality of service given by Members like yourselves. It is important that we all continue to convey that to the American public. We know that Members are doing that, and we thank the Members for that. It is a joint effort that all Members need to be involved in to uphold the strength of our democracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me again welcome each and every Member back to the House of Representatives. Their service is appreciated by all Members who currently serve and by all America.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

□ 1010

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, let me say I am concerned. I mean, looking at them, I wonder, were they so much younger when they were here? Now they look so much younger than we do now. Why is that? Did the people elect them much younger in those days?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. President, I should observe that the gentleman from California must be speaking for himself.

Mr. ANDERSON. All right. I do that, too, sometimes.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). The Chair would note that the gentleman from California looks quite well for his age, and he is doing quite well.

The Chair would also note that when this Member came to this institution 13 years ago, he had the great honor and privilege to serve with Members whom I consider to be some of the giants in the Congress at that time, and at this time the Chair would now like to recognize one of those giants, the Honorable Richardson Preyer to take the chair.

(Mr. RICHARDSON PREYER of North Carolina assumed the chair.)

Mr. PREYER (presiding). The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Mr. JOHN MYERS.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], in welcoming all these strangers back. I apologize for our minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], who had hoped to be here, but because of an extended meeting at the White House he is unable to be here to welcome you back on the Republican side.

Looking at each of you here today, I recall that I have had the privilege through the years of serving with a great many of you. As the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] said, as

we came here as freshmen, many of us have kind of forgotten all that experience through all these years, but as freshmen we remember, even though many of us did serve in legislatures and in other high positions, that when we got here, we were really on a strange field. Things were new, things were different, and we kind of carefully had to stick our toes in the water. And then it was kind of nice to have someone with us who had been in the water, not just sticking his toes in the water.

So as I look around, I see there are a great many of you here who were here when I got here 23 years ago to help welcome us and make life a little easier for freshman Members, particularly one from a little area in Indiana where I come from.

So personally, I say, thank you for the help you have given me and that you continue to give to those of us who are still here and have to make some of the decisions, decisions that are hopefully and prayerfully right decisions. It is good that you are still here to offer that counsel.

I can recall that as I came to the floor, it was with some confidence if I could look to a senior Member, one that I could go to and say, "I am troubled with this vote." I know all of us have been there. How nice it is to have someone of experience that we had confidence in, someone we could go to.

But how quick it all happened to us. Now there is no one for us to look to. We used to come to senior Members, as I say, and we still need help, even those of us who are here now, to make difficult decisions. So we still lean very heavily on your counsel.

I know a great many of you have written to each of us as we live through these troubled times and as we look to you for solutions for difficult problems. We thank you for your participation in this group that hopefully all of us will join someday—some of us maybe sooner than we would like—but in any event, we do appreciate the contributions you have made to our country and the sacrifices that you made back then. We also appreciate the contributions you continue to make.

So we are always pleased to have you come back, and we thank you very much for what you have done for the Nation and for each of us individually. So we say, welcome home. [Applause.]

Mr. PREYER (presiding). We thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for their eloquent comments which emphasize the bipartisan spirit and nature of this undertaking.

The Clerk will now call the roll of the former Members of Congress.

The Clerk called the roll of former Members of the Congress, and follow-

ing former Members answered to their names:

ROLLCALL OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ATTENDING ANNUAL MEETING, MAY 11, 1989

Thomas G. Abernethy of Mississippi;
Hugh Q. Alexander of North Carolina;

William H. Ayres of Ohio;
Lamar Baker of Tennessee;
Joseph W. Barr of Indiana;
J. Glenn Beall, Jr. of Maryland;
Edward P. Boland of Massachusetts;
Joel T. Broyhill of Virginia;
John H. Buchanan, Jr. of Alabama;
Howard W. Cannon of Nevada;
Elford A. Cederberg of Michigan;
Charles E. Chamberlain of Michigan;

Albert M. Cole of Kansas;
Jeffery Cohelan of California;
James C. Corman of California;
James K. Coyne of Pennsylvania;
Paul W. Cronin of Massachusetts;
William C. Cramer of Florida;
Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois;
Michael A. Feighan of Ohio;
James M. Hanley of New York;
Robert P. Hanrahan of Illinois;
Ralph R. Harding of Idaho;
Harry G. Haskell of Delaware;
William D. Hathaway of Maine;
Jeffrey P. Hillelson of Missouri;
A. Oakley Hunter of California;
Jed Johnson, Jr. of Oklahoma;
Walter H. Judd of Minnesota;
Frank M. Karsten of Missouri;
Hastings Keith of Massachusetts;
Martha Keys of Kansas;
Ernest L. Konnyu of California;
Horace R. Kornegay of North Carolina;

Peter N. Kyros of Maine;
Jim Lloyd of California;
William S. Mailliard of California;
James R. Mann of South Carolina;
Edwin H. May, Jr. of Connecticut;
George Meader of Michigan;
D. Bailey Merrill of Indiana;
Abner J. Mikva of Illinois;
Chester L. Mize of Kansas;
John S. Monagan of Connecticut;
Shirley Pettis of California;
Howard W. Pollock of Alaska;
Richardson Preyer of North Carolina;

James M. Quigley of Pennsylvania;
J. Kenneth Robinson of Virginia;
John H. Rousselot of California;
Philip E. Ruppe of Michigan;
Harold S. Sawyer of Michigan;
Richard S. Schweiker of Pennsylvania;

William L. Scott of Virginia;
Carlton R. Sickles of Maryland;
Garner E. Shriver of Kansas;
Alfred D. Sieminski of New Jersey;
Henry P. Smith III of New York;
David Michael Staton of West Virginia;

Gene Taylor of Missouri;
John H. Terry of New York;
Andrew Jackson Transue of Michigan;

Charles W. Whalen, Jr. of Ohio;

Larry Winn, Jr. of Kansas; and
Louis C. Wyman of New Hampshire.

□ 1020

Mr. PREYER (presiding). The Chair at this time recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Elford A. Cederberg.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to you that our Congressional Alumni Association has successfully completed its 19th year. We end our second decade with renewed confidence in the value of our organization that our late beloved colleague, Mr. Hays of Arkansas, and our distinguished cofounder, Dr. Judd of Minnesota (who is with us today), called into existence in the spring of 1970.

We gather together on the House floor at a time of unprecedented resurgence of democracy throughout the world. Whether it be in the streets of Beijing or Tbilisi, people are demanding self-determination, the rights of free speech, freedom of the press and the consent of the governed.

This is an historic opportunity for freedom loving men and women to work together to move the world a little closer toward governments of law and order that uphold the dignity of the individual and the right of self-determination through free and fair elections be they in Budapest or Panama.

The world is stirring and striving toward a new birth of freedom. Our association hopes to continue to play a small, but vital role in that expansion of new frontiers of freedom. Let me give you one current example. At our fifth seminar held in Berlin last month that the association sponsored bringing together members of the Congress with their counterparts from the German Bundestag we were challenged by the U.S. Ambassador to Hungary, Mark Palmer, to send teams to Budapest who can help provide the Hungarian Parliament technical assistance and expertise in building a multiparty parliamentary system with which they have had no experience in more than 40 years.

We want to encourage several other organizations to join with us in this endeavor such as the newly created Association of Former Members of the New Zealand Parliament, the Canadian Parliament and the Australian Parliament. We are pleased to have at our meeting John Reid, who served 20 years in the Canadian Parliament and is the president of the Canadian Association of Former Members of Parliament. We have conducted several programs with our Canadian colleagues including a "Wingspread" seminar in Wisconsin and campus fellows visits to United States college campuses by two former Canadian M.P.'s as well as having held our fall meeting in 1979 in Ottawa, Canada. So we have worked

closely with our Canadian colleagues in the past and look forward to working with them in the future. Another of the projects that we are exploring with our Canadian friends is the undertaking of a comparative study of the Canadian Parliament and the United States Congress similar to the one we completed several years ago comparing the Japanese Diet and the United States Congress that has been published in both Japanese and English editions which are used widely in comparative government programs and in cross-cultural exchanges in both countries. Our German Bundestag-United States Congress study has been completed and the German edition was presented to the German Bundestag last week. The English edition is at the publishers and will be presented to the Congress this fall. This project was funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, U.S.I.A. and the Friedrich-Naumann Foundation.

We are very proud of these studies and hope in the future to include a comparative study of the European Parliament and the Congress.

Each year over the past 7 years we have held a program with our colleagues in the Association of Former Members of the German Bundestag bringing Members of the Congress and Members of the Bundestag. These programs take the shape of seminars such as we held this spring in Berlin on the subject of "The European Economic Community and 1992" or in the form of bringing Bundestag members to visit individual congressional districts as we did in the 1986 and 1988 elections. These seminars and exchanges are cosponsored by the German Marshall Fund of the United States and U.S.I.A. to which we express our appreciation. Out of these congressional exchanges and seminars has grown a Congressional Study Group on Germany in the House with some 76 Members that this year is chaired by Representative TOM COLEMAN of Missouri. Senator ROTH of Delaware who participated in our Berlin seminar is in the process of creating a counterpart study group in the Senate.

We also this year continued our Congressional Fellowship Program for Japanese Diet staff members who come to the Capitol for 60 days and work in different congressional offices and committees to learn about our congressional system through firsthand experience. This program has been funded by the Japan-United States Friendship Commission and through a renewed grant will be continued this fall.

This year, under a contract from U.S.I.A., we brought to the United States for a 14-day visit a delegation from the Foreign Affairs Committee of the National Congress of the People's Republic of China. This delega-

tion was the first from their Foreign Affairs Committee and they met with a number of the leaders of the Congress including the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, and a ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. LUGAR.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert at this place in the RECORD a letter and read the letter that I received from our colleague in China. This letter is addressed to me, and I thought it would be worth reading. It is dated April 11, 1989.

NATIONAL PEOPLE'S CONGRESS,
April 11, 1989.

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
Association of Former Members of Congress,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CEDERBERG: My colleagues and I thank you and your Association for hosting in the United States the delegation from the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Chinese National People's Congress.

Our visit to your country was both successful and significant. Thanks to your thoughtful arrangements, we were able to meet and talk with people from political and economic circles as well as specialists and professors from various academic fields.

We believe such contacts are useful in bettering our mutual understandings and hope they can be continued to promote the friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

I am sincerely hoping that you and a delegation your Association organized will come to visit China soon.

Best wishes,

FU HAO,
Vice Chairman, Foreign Affairs
Committee.

This year we also cosponsored our second conference at the Gerald R. Ford Library on democracy and participated in a planning session at the Carter Center of a second conference on human rights in the Soviet Union scheduled this fall.

Mr. Speaker, the program of which we are the proudest is our Campus Fellows Program where we sent to college campuses persons who have served in the Congress of the United States. This week our colleague, Robert Gialmo of Connecticut, is making such a visit to California Polytechnic University which is our 222d campus visit. I ask permission to list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of those campuses visited as well as the names of fellows and the States from which they served. You will notice on that list we do not send anyone to a campus in the State from which they served in the Congress. This is to ensure maximum objectivity in this program to interpret the Congress as an institution. This program has been enormously successful and we expect in the next year to begin some innovations in the format which will extend the time of some of our visits.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES VISITED UNDER THE CONGRESSIONAL ALUMNI CAMPUS FELLOWS PROGRAM

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY, STATE AND FELLOW

Alaska Pacific University, Alaska, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Albion College, Michigan, David S. King (Utah).
 Albion College, Michigan, Ted Kupferman (New York).
 Albion College, Michigan, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 Alfred University, New York, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 American College in Paris, France, David S. King (Utah).
 American College in Paris, France, Byron L. Johnson (Colorado).
 Arizona State University, Arizona, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Arizona State University,¹ Arizona, Jacques Soustelle (France).
 Assumption College, Massachusetts, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Auburn University, Alabama, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Auburn University,¹ Alabama, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).
 Avila College,¹ Kansas, Karin Hafstad (Norway).
 Bainbridge Jr. College, Georgia, Gilbert Gude (Maryland).
 Baylor University, Texas, James Roosevelt (California).
 Baylor University,¹ Texas, Peter von der Heydt (Germany).
 Bowling Green State University, Ohio, Robert P. Hanrahan (Illinois).
 Bradley University, Illinois, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
 Brandeis University, Massachusetts, Abner J. Mikva (Illinois).
 Brandeis University, Massachusetts, L. Richardson Preyer (North Carolina).
 Brenau College, Georgia, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Brigham Young University,¹ Utah, Jacques Soustelle (France).
 California Poly. State—San Luis Obispo, California, John B. Anderson (Illinois).
 California Poly. State—San Luis Obispo, California, Frank E. Evans (Colorado).
 California Poly. State—San Luis Obispo, California, Robert N. Giaimo (Connecticut).
 California Poly. State—San Luis Obispo, California, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 California Poly. State—Pomona, California, Robert R. Barry (New York).
 Cameron University, Oklahoma, William D. Hathaway (Maine).
 Cameron University, Oklahoma, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Cameron University, Oklahoma, Dick Clark (Iowa).
 Carleton College, Minnesota, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Carroll College, Montana, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Chaminade College, Hawaii, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).
 Chatham College, Pennsylvania, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).
 Chatham College, Pennsylvania, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 Charleston College, South Carolina, John M. Reid (Canada).
 Clarke College, Georgia, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Clark College, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Colgate University, New York, William S. Mailliard (California).
 College of the Sequoias, California, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Colorado State University, Colorado, Alastair Gillespie (Canada).
 Columbia College, South Carolina, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).
 Columbia College, South Carolina, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 Columbia College, South Carolina, James M. Quigley (Pennsylvania).
 Columbia College, South Carolina, John M. Reid (Canada).
 Columbia College, South Carolina, Henry S. Reuss (Wisconsin).
 Concordia College, Michigan, Walter H. Moeller (Ohio).
 Connecticut College, Connecticut, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Converse College, South Carolina, Jed Johnson, Jr. (Oklahoma).
 Dartmouth College, New Hampshire, John O. Marsh, Jr. (Virginia).
 Dartmouth College, New Hampshire, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Davis & Elkins College, West Virginia, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 Davis & Elkins, West Virginia, J. Glenn Beall, Jr. (Maryland).
 Denison University, Ohio, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 DePauw University, Indiana, Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania).
 Dillard University, Louisiana, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).
 Doshisha University, Japan, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).
 Duke University, North Carolina, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).
 Eckerd College, Florida, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Elmira College, New York, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
 Friends University, Kansas, Henry P. Smith, III (New York).
 Furman University, South Carolina, Jed Johnson, Jr. (Oklahoma).
 Furman University, South Carolina, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
 Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Celio Borja (Brazil).
 Grinnell College, Iowa, Neil Staebler (Michigan).
 Guilford College, North Carolina, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Gustavus Adolphus College, Minnesota, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
 Hamilton College, New York, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Hartwick College, New York, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Hiram College, Ohio, Howard H. Callaway (Georgia).
 Hiram College, Ohio, Roman L. Hruska (Nebraska).
 Hope College, Michigan, Walter H. Judd (Minnesota).
 Hope College, Michigan, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Hope College, Michigan, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).
 Idaho State University, Idaho, John R. Schmidhauser (Iowa).
 Indiana State University, Indiana, Gordon L. Allot (Colorado).
 Indiana Univ. Northwest, Indiana, Neil Staebler (Michigan).
 Indiana Univ. Northwest, Indiana, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Indiana Univ. Northwest, Indiana, Tom Railsback (Illinois).
 Jackson State University, Mississippi, Allard K. Lowenstein (New York).
 Johns Hopkins University, Maryland, Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania).
 Johns Hopkins University, Washington, DC, Celio Borja (Brazil).

Kansai University, Japan, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 Kansas-Newman College, Kansas, Henry P. Smith, III (New York).
 Kansas State University, Kansas, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr. (California).
 Keio University, Japan, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 King College, Tennessee, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).
 King's College, Pennsylvania, Philip Hayes (Indiana).
 Kirkland College, New York, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan, Frank E. Moss (Utah).
 LaGrange College, Georgia, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Lake Forest College, Illinois, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Lindenwood College, Missouri, Gaylord Nelson (Wisconsin).
 Longwood College, Virginia, Paul W. Cronin (Massachusetts).
 Luther College, Iowa, Gilbert Gude (Maryland).
 McNeese University, Louisiana, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Marshall University, West Virginia, John J. Gilligan (Ohio).
 Mary Hardin Baylor College, Texas, Brooks Hays (Arkansas).
 Matanuska-Susitna Community College, Alaska, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Mesa Community College, Arizona, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).
 Miami University-Middletown, Ohio, James Roosevelt (California).
 Miami University-Middletown, Ohio, James W. Symington (Missouri).
 Mid-America Nazarene College, Kansas, John B. Anderson (Illinois).
 Mid-America Nazarene College, Kansas, John Dellenback (Oregon).
 Millsaps College, Mississippi, Allard K. Lowenstein (New York).
 Montclair State College, New Jersey, Walter H. Judd (Minnesota).
 Montclair State College, New Jersey, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Morehead State University, Kentucky, Dan Kuykendall (Tennessee).
 Morehouse College, Georgia, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Morehouse College, Georgia, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Morris Brown College, Georgia, William S. Mailliard (California).
 Morris Brown College, Georgia, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Mount Vernon College, Washington, DC, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 Murray State University, Kentucky, Brooks Hays (Arkansas).
 Nanzen University, Japan, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).
 New York University, New York, George McGovern (South Dakota).
 Northern Illinois University, Illinois, William L. Hungate (Missouri).
 Northern Kentucky University, Kentucky, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 North Park College,¹ Illinois, Karin Hafstad (Norway).
 Northwestern University,¹ Illinois, Karin Hafstad (Norway).
 Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).
 Oregon State University, Oregon, Martha Keys (Kansas).
 Otterbein College, Ohio, James Roosevelt (California).
 Purdue University-Calumet, Indiana, William L. Hungate (Missouri).

Purdue University-Calumet, Indiana, Tom Railsback (Illinois).

Randolph-Macon College, Virginia, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Randolph-Macon College,¹ Virginia, Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania).

Rockhurst College,¹ Kansas, Karin Hafstad (Norway).

Rose Hulman Institute of Technology, Indiana, Gordon L. Allott (Colorado).

St. Cloud State University, Minnesota, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).

St. Lawrence University, New York, Roman L. Pucinski (Illinois).

St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana, Gordon L. Allott (Colorado).

St. Mary's College, Indiana, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

St. Michael's College, Vermont, Walter H. Judd (Minnesota).

St. Norbert's College, Wisconsin, Martha Keys (Kansas).

St. Olaf College, Minnesota, William S. Mailliard (California).

Salem College, North Carolina, Martha Keys (Kansas).

Sangamon State University, Illinois, Andrew J. Blemiller (Wisconsin).

Sangamon State University, Illinois, Martha Keys (Kansas).

Sangamon State University,¹ Illinois, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).

Sangamon State University,¹ Illinois, Alastair Gillespie (Canada).

Siena College, New York, Frank E. Moss (Utah).

Siena College, New York, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).

Southeast Community College, Kentucky, Donald E. Lukens (Ohio).

Southern Illinois University, Illinois, John R. Schmidhauser (Iowa).

Southwestern College, Kansas, Henry P. Smith, III (New York).

Spelman College, Georgia, William S. Mailliard (California).

Spelman College, Georgia, William L. Hungate (Missouri).

SUNY-Binghamton, New York, John B. Anderson (Illinois).

SUNY-Plattsburg, New York, L. Richardson Preyer (North Carolina).

State University of Oswego, New York, Martha Keys (Kansas).

Syracuse University, New York, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).

Talladega College, Alabama, Ted Kupferman (New York).

Tougaloo Southern Christian College, Mississippi, Allard K. Lowenstein (New York).

Transylvania University, Kentucky, James M. Quigley (Pennsylvania).

U.S. Air Force Academy,¹ Colorado, Alan Lee Williams (Great Britain).

U.S. Coast Guard Academy, Connecticut, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).

U.S. Naval Academy, Maryland, John S. Monagan (Connecticut).

U.S. Naval Academy, Maryland, William S. Mailliard (California).

U.S. Naval Academy,¹ Maryland, Alan Lee Williams (Great Britain).

University of Alaska, Alaska, William L. Hungate (Missouri).

University of Alaska, Alaska, William S. Mailliard (California).

University of Arizona, Arizona, Celio Borja (Brazil).

University of Arkansas,¹ Arkansas, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

University of Arkansas, Arkansas, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).

University of California—Berkeley, California, Robert N. Giaimo (Connecticut).

University of California—Berkeley, California, Henry S. Reuss (Wisconsin).

University of California—Berkeley, California, Newton I. Steers, Jr. (Maryland).

University of Dayton, Ohio, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).

University of Delaware, Delaware, John J. Gilligan (Ohio).

University of Delaware, Delaware, Henry S. Reuss (Wisconsin).

University of Georgia,¹ Georgia, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).

University of Georgia,¹ Georgia, Otis Pike (New York).

University of Georgia,¹ Georgia, John M. Reid (Canada).

University of Georgia,¹ Georgia, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).

University of Hawaii, Hawaii, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr. (California).

University of Maine-Orono, Maine, John Rhodes (Arizona).

University of Michigan-Flint, Michigan, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

University of Mississippi, Mississippi, Tom Railsback (Illinois).

University of Nevada, Nevada, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

University of New Mexico,¹ New Mexico, Alastair Gillespie (Canada).

University of New Mexico,¹ New Mexico, Celio Borja (Brazil).

University of New Orleans,¹ Louisiana, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).

University of New Orleans,¹ Louisiana, Jacques Soustelle (France).

University of North Carolina, North Carolina, Robert P. Hanrahan (Illinois).

University of North Dakota, North Dakota, Neil Staebler (Michigan).

University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).

University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, Dick Clark (Iowa).

University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, Martha Keys (Kansas).

University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, William S. Mailliard (California).

University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio).

University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, Frank E. Moss (Utah).

University of Oregon, Oregon, Martha Keys (Kansas).

University of Redlands, California, Catherine May Bedell (Washington).

University of South Carolina,¹ South Carolina, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).

University of South Carolina, South Carolina, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

University of South Dakota, South Dakota, William L. Hungate (Missouri).

University of Texas,¹ Texas, Alastair Gillespie (Canada).

University of Texas,¹ Texas, Celio Borja (Brazil).

University of Utah, Utah, Robert N. Giaimo (Connecticut).

University of Utah,¹ Utah, Jacques Soustelle (France).

University of Utah,¹ Utah, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).

University of Washington,¹ Washington, Alan Lee Williams (United Kingdom).

University of West Virginia,¹ West Virginia, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).

University of West Virginia,¹ West Virginia, Jacques Soustelle (France).

University of Wisconsin,¹ Wisconsin, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).

University of Wyoming, Wyoming, Frank E. Moss (Utah).

Urbana University, Ohio, David S. King (Utah).

Valparaiso University, Indiana, Neil Staebler (Michigan).

Vanderbilt University, Tennessee, Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas).

Vanderbilt University,¹ Tennessee, Celio Borja (Brazil).

Virginia Military Institute, Virginia, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Wake Forest University,¹ North Carolina, William L. Hungate (Missouri).

Wake Forest University, North Carolina, Georg Kahn-Ackermann (Germany).

Washington College, Maryland, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Washington & Lee University, Virginia, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Wayne State College, Nebraska, Gale W. McGee (Wyoming).

Westmont College, California, Ronald A. Sarasin (Connecticut).

Wheaton College, Massachusetts, Charles A. Vanik (Ohio).

Whitman College, Washington, Frank E. Moss (Utah).

William & Mary College, Virginia, Hugh Scott (Pennsylvania).

Wofford College, South Carolina, Jed Johnson, Jr. (Oklahoma).

222 visits—68 fellows.

¹ International project funded by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations for visit of parliamentarians from the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Canada, Brazil and Norway.

Mr. Speaker, all of these projects cost money and it is appropriate at this time to list our 279 foundation, corporate, individual, and other sponsors that make our educational programs possible. I will insert in the RECORD at this point a list of our sponsors:

SPONSORS OF THE U.S. ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, MAY 11, 1989

PATRONS¹

1. Ford Foundation.
2. German Marshall Fund of the United States.
3. Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.
4. U.S. Information Agency.

BENEFACTORS²

5. National Endowment for the Humanities.
6. Rockefeller Foundation.
7. United Parcel Service Foundation.

DONORS³

8. Anonymous Individual.
9. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.
10. John Crain Kunkel Foundation.
11. Lilly Endowment, Inc.

FRIENDS⁴

12. Anonymous Foundation.
13. Anonymous Individual.
14. Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.
15. Carnegie Corporation of New York.
16. Carnegie Corporation of New York—Aging Project.
17. Exxon Education Foundation.
18. FMC Corporation Foundation.
19. Hon. Charles K. Fletcher.
20. German Bundestag.
21. Grand Street Boys' Foundation.
22. Flora & William Hewlett Foundation.
23. Howard H. Callaway Foundation.
24. Hon. Jed Johnson, Jr.
25. Hon. Walter H. Judd.
26. Hon. William S. Mailliard.
27. Hon. D. Bailey Merrill.
28. Louise Taft Semple Foundation.
29. The Tobacco Institute.

- 30. U.S. Association Auxiliary.
- 31. U.S. Department of State.
- 32. Unilever United States.
- 33. University of South Carolina, Byrnes Center.

SUPPORTERS *

- 34. Hon. Charles E. Chamberlain.
- 35. Champion International Corporation.
- 36. Delphi Research.
- 37. Forbes Foundation.
- 38. H.J. Heinz Charitable Trust.
- 39. Home Federal Saving & Loan Association.
- 40. Mrs. Benjamin F. James.
- 41. The Johnson Foundation.
- 42. Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company.
- 43. Mobil Oil Corporation.
- 44. Hon. Frank E. Moss.
- 45. Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co.
- 46. Hon. Otis Pike.
- 47. The Prudential Foundation.
- 48. Hon. John J. Rhodes.
- 49. Sangamon State University.
- 50. Florence & John Schumann Foundation.
- 51. Hon. Herbert Tenzer.
- 52. 3M Corporation.
- 53. Hon. Andrew Jackson Transue.
- 54. United Technologies.
- 55. U.S. National Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation.
- 56. U.S.-Japan Foundation.
- 57. University of Oklahoma Foundation.
- 58. Mr. Philippe Villers.

SPONSORS *

- 59. A.T. & T. Corporation.
- 60. Albion College.
- 61. AMAX Foundation.
- 62. American-Israel Friendship League.
- 63. American Brands, Inc.
- 64. American Consulting Engineers Council.
- 65. American Family Life Assurance Company.
- 66. American Income Life Insurance Company.
- 67. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.
- 68. Hon. Beryl Anthony.
- 69. Mrs. Leslie C. Arends.
- 70. Ashland Oil Company, Inc.
- 71. Atlantic Council of the United States.
- 72. Hon. Lamar Baker.
- 73. Baltimore Gas & Electric Company.
- 74. Bank of America.
- 75. Hon. Joseph W. Barr.
- 76. Hon. Robert R. Barry.
- 77. Battelle Memorial Institute.
- 78. Baylor University.
- 79. Hon. J. Glenn Beall, Jr.
- 80. Mrs. J. Glenn Beall.
- 81. Hon. Berkley Bedell.
- 82. Hon. Catherine May Bedell.
- 83. Beech Aircraft Corporation.
- 84. Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham.
- 85. Black & Decker Manufacturing Company.
- 86. Hon. Iris F. Blitch.
- 87. Hon. J. Caleb Boggs.
- 88. Hon. Albert H. Bosch.
- 89. Hon. Garry Brown.
- 90. Hon. Charles B. Brownson.
- 91. Mrs. Charles B. Brownson.
- 92. Hon. James T. Broyhill.
- 93. Hon. Joel T. Broyhill.
- 94. Hon. James L. Buckley.
- 95. Hon. Harry F. Byrd, Jr.
- 96. Hon. William T. Cahill.
- 97. California Polytechnic University.
- 98. Hon. Howard Cannon.
- 99. Hon. Frank Carlson.
- 100. Mrs. Terry Carpenter.

- 101. Castle & Cooke, Inc.
- 102. Hon. Elford A. Cederberg.
- 103. Cedar Hill Memorial Park.
- 104. Anonymous Individual.
- 105. Hon. James C. Cleveland.
- 106. Hon. and Mrs. Jeffery Cohelan.
- 107. Hon. W. Sterling Cole.
- 108. James M. Collins Foundation.
- 109. Columbia College.
- 110. Congressional Staff Directory.
- 111. Mr. Ralph J. Cornell.
- 112. Coyne Chemical Company.
- 113. Hon. James K. Coyne.
- 114. Hon. William C. Cramer.
- 115. Hon. Paul W. Cronin.
- 116. Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, Inc.
- 117. Mrs. Robert V. Denney.
- 118. Hon. John Dent.
- 119. Ernst & Paula Deutsch Foundation.
- 120. Distilled Spirits Council.
- 121. Hon. Robert Dole.
- 122. Mrs. Francis Dorn.
- 123. Mr. Ernst Van Eeghen.
- 124. Exxon Company, U.S.A.
- 125. Hon. Leonard Fabstein.
- 126. Federal National Mortgage Association.
- 127. Hon. Michael A. Feighan.
- 128. Finance Factors Foundation.
- 129. Ford Motor Company Fund.
- 130. Gerald R. Ford Foundation.
- 131. Hon. J. Allen Frear, Jr.
- 132. Hon. Peter H.B. Frelinghuysen.
- 133. Hon. J.W. Fulbright.
- 134. Hon. David H. Gambrell.
- 135. General Electric Company.
- 136. General Electric Foundation.
- 137. Hon. Robert N. Giaimo.
- 138. Hon. Robert A. Grant.
- 139. Hon. Gilbert Gude.
- 140. Gulf Oil Corporation.
- 141. Hon. Thomas M. Hagedorn.
- 142. Mrs. Audrey Hagen.
- 143. Hanna Family Foundation.
- 144. Hon. Robert P. Hanrahan.
- 145. Hon. Ralph R. Harding.
- 146. Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr.
- 147. Hon. Oren E. Harris.
- 148. Hon. Thomas F. Hartnett.
- 149. Hartwick College.
- 150. Hon. Floyd K. Haskell.
- 151. Hon. William Hathaway.
- 152. Mr. Yasuhiko Hayshiyama.
- 153. Hon. Brooks Hays.
- 154. Hon. A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.
- 155. Hon. Jeffrey P. Hillelson.
- 156. Hope College.
- 157. Hon. Roman L. Hruska.
- 158. Hughes Aircraft Company.
- 159. Hon. William L. Hungate.
- 160. Hon. A. Oakley Hunter.
- 161. Hon. J. Edward Hutchinson.
- 162. Mrs. J. Edward Hutchinson.
- 163. I. B. M.
- 164. Institute of International Education.
- 165. International Harvester.
- 166. International Union of Operating Engineers.
- 167. Mrs. Frieda James.
- 168. Hon. James R. Jones.
- 169. Hon. William J. Keating.
- 170. Hon. Hasting Keith.
- 171. Kemper Educational & Charitable Fund.
- 172. Mr. J.C. Kennedy.
- 173. Hon. Joe M. Kilgore.
- 174. LaGrange College.
- 175. Representative Norman F. Lent.
- 176. Lincoln Memorial Park.
- 177. Hon. John V. Lindsay.
- 178. Hon. Russell B. Long.
- 179. Hon. Clare Booth Luce.
- 180. Luther College.
- 181. Hon. Robert McClory.

- 182. Hon. Paul N. McCloskey, Jr.
- 183. Hon. Gale W. McGee.
- 184. McNeese State University.
- 185. MMB Associates.
- 186. Mt. Vernon College.
- 187. Hon. Clark MacGregor.
- 188. Hon. James G. Martin.
- 189. Matanuska-Susitna Community College.
- 190. Hon. M. Dawson Mathis.
- 191. Hon. Edwin H. May, Jr.
- 192. Mrs. Adelaide Bolton Meister.
- 193. Mrs. D. Bailey Merrill.
- 194. Hon. Helen S. Meyner.
- 195. Miami University-Ohio.
- 196. Mid-America Nazarene College.
- 197. Hon. Joseph G. Minish.
- 198. Hon. Chester L. Mize.
- 199. Hon. John S. Monagan.
- 200. Hon. Frank E. Moss.
- 201. Mr. Richard Murphy.
- 202. National Association of Independent Insurers.
- 203. National Education Association.
- 204. National Study Commission on Public Documents.
- 205. New York University.
- 206. Northern Kentucky University.
- 207. O'Connor & Hannan.
- 208. Mrs. Alvin E. O'Konski.
- 209. Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
- 210. Representative Solomon P. Ortiz.
- 211. Pacific Federal Savings & Loan Association.
- 212. R.T. Packing Corp.
- 213. Hon. Edward Pattison.
- 214. Hon. Shirley N. Pettis.
- 215. The Pfizer Foundation.
- 216. Pioneer Federal Savings & Loan Association.
- 217. Hon. Bertram Podell.
- 218. Hon. Howard W. Pollock.
- 219. Hon. James M. Quigley.
- 220. Hon. Ben Reifel.
- 221. Relief Foundation, Inc.
- 222. Hon. Henry S. Reuss.
- 223. Reynolds Metals Company.
- 224. R.J. Reynolds Industries, Inc.
- 225. Hon. Richardson Preyer.
- 226. Hon. J. Kenneth Robinson.
- 227. Hon. John Robison.
- 228. Hon. Paul Rogers.
- 229. Hon. Fred B. Rooney.
- 230. Hon. John H. Roussetot.
- 231. Hon. William R. Roy.
- 232. Hon. Philip E. Ruppe.
- 233. Salem College.
- 234. Hon. Harold S. Sawyer.
- 235. Dr. Scholl Foundation.
- 236. Hon. Hugh Scott.
- 237. Hon. William L. Scott.
- 238. G. D. Searle & Company.
- 239. Sears, Roebuck & Company.
- 240. Mrs. Harry O. Sheppard.
- 241. Hon. Carlton R. Sickles.
- 242. Siena College.
- 243. Hon. Henry P. Smith, III.
- 244. Smith Kline Corporation.
- 245. Hon. Gene Snyder.
- 246. Sperry Corporation.
- 247. Hon. William L. Springer.
- 248. St. Cloud University.
- 249. Hon. Neil Staebler.
- 250. Hon. Williamson S. Stuckey, Jr.
- 251. Sun Company, Inc.
- 252. SUNY-Binghamton University.
- 253. SUNY-Plattsburgh University.
- 254. Hon. Robert Sweeney.
- 255. Hon. James W. Symington.
- 256. TRW, Inc.
- 257. Hon. Robert Taft, Jr.
- 258. Florrie & Herbert Tenzer Philanthropic Fund.
- 259. Hon. Lera Thomas.

- 260. Mrs. Devon O. Thompson.
- 261. U.S. Capitol Historical Society.
- 262. University of Alaska.
- 263. University of Arkansas-Monticello.
- 264. University of California-Berkeley.
- 265. University of Dayton.
- 266. University of Delaware.
- 267. University of Mississippi.
- 268. University of Utah.
- 269. Representative Guy Vander Jagt.
- 270. Hon. Victor V. Veysey.
- 271. Washington Institute for Value in Public Policy.
- 272. Whalley Charitable Trust.
- 273. Hon. G. William Whitehurst.
- 274. Hon. Larry Winn.
- 275. Hon. Louis C. Wyman.
- 276. Mr. and Mrs. James Yao.
- 277. Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough.
- 278. Yeshiva University.
- 279. Hon. Samuel H. Young.

¹ Patrons have contributed at least \$250,000.
² Benefactors have contributed between \$100,000 and \$250,000.

³ Donors have contributed between \$50,000 and \$100,000.

⁴ Friends have contributed between \$10,000 and \$50,000.

⁵ Supporters have contributed between \$5,000 and \$10,000.

⁶ Sponsors have contributed between \$1,000 and \$5,000.

It is now my sad duty to report to the Congress the list of our deceased colleagues who have passed away since our report last spring: Gordon L. Allott of Colorado; Robert R. Barry of New York; Charles B. Brownson of Indiana; Price Daniel of Texas; Glenn R. Davis of Wisconsin; James P.S. Devereaux of Maryland; James Domengeaux of Louisiana; Thaddeus J. Dulski of New York; Charles R. Jonas of North Carolina; James Kee of West Virginia; Robert McClory Illinois; James G. O'Hara of Michigan; Ellis E. Patterson of California; Monroe M. Redden of North Carolina; David E. Satterfield III of Virginia; Gordon H. Scherer of Ohio; Leonor K. Sullivan-Archibald of Missouri; Stuart Symington of Missouri, and Basil Whitener of North Carolina.

I noticed in this morning's paper that we lost another of our colleagues, Kenneth Roberts of Alabama. I knew him so well. He passed away here I believe yesterday, for which we are very sad.

I ask for a moment of silence in their memory.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to report to you that the gentleman from Illinois, Judge Mikva, who is our vice president, will become president the end of next month and lead the association in its 20th year. He will have as his vice president the able assistance of the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Rhodes.

Each year we present a Distinguished Service Award. The list itself is a very imposing one, beginning in 1974 with Gerald R. Ford and continuing with John W. McCormack, Lewis Deschler, Sam Ervin, Jr., Nelson Rockefeller, George H. Mahon, Clare Boothe Luce, Edmund S. Muskie, Hugh Scott, Richard Bolling, Jacob K.

Javits, J. William Fulbright, Walter H. Judd, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., and John J. Rhodes. This year it is my honor to present the 1989 Distinguished Service Award to our long-time colleague, Edward Boland, who served in this body with distinction for 36 years from Massachusetts.

I remember so well, if you will pardon just a little personal comment here, when we came together in the 83d Congress back in 1953, we had some pretty good guys in that Congress. Tip O'Neill, Johnnie Rhodes, Mel Laird, and many of us who came. We had a distinguished class. One of the most distinguished was our friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Ed, if you will come up here now, I would like to present you with this gavel, but first, before I do that, we have a book of letters from many of your current and former colleagues, to you, telling you how much they think of you. I think they are all pretty good.

Ed, I would like to present this to you on behalf of the Former Members of Congress Association. We appreciate your being here very much.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, ever since my retirement I have moved to the conservative side of this aisle, so here I am.

Mr. Speaker, former Members of Congress, and present Members, I am deeply touched to be this year's Distinguished Public Service Award winner.

I want to thank President Al Cederberg, and the officers and members of the Association of Former Members of Congress for this great honor. The recognition of one's peers in an endeavor as challenging as politics is particularly meaningful, and I am truly appreciative of the good wishes that go with this award.

I am particularly pleased that my wife, Mary, is with me today. On many occasions during my service here, the demands of family meant that I had to fly from Massachusetts to some event in the Capitol alone, while Mary stayed at home in Springfield.

That we can now come to Washington together is one of the best "perks" of my new status as a former Member of Congress.

Two years ago, you honored former Speaker Tip O'Neill with the Distinguished Public Service Award. On the off chance that some of the notoriety which he enjoys is a byproduct of this award, I have been practicing the suitcase trick he does in his new hotel commercial. I want to be ready in case any casting agents call.

I spent 36 years in this Chamber, and I can tell you that it feels good to be back, if only for a day. There is no institution quite like the U.S. Congress. The privilege of serving here is one of the greatest gifts the citizens of our country can bestow.

To the people of western Massachusetts goes my gratitude for having been permitted to represent them in these halls for so much of my career in public life.

This Chamber holds many memories for me. I do not know the precise number of men and women with whom I served during my tenure, although I imagine it was in the thousands. But I do recall the frequent examples of courage, kindness, and grace under pressure that enriched the life of this institution.

I recall as well some of the great questions that were debated on this floor involving: the commitment of U.S. forces to hostile situations in countries far from our own, efforts to advance the cause of civil rights and human dignity in our own Nation, and throughout the world, the expansion of educational and economic opportunity, and the assurance of a place for the United States in the exploration of the universe. Those debates were long and arduous, sometimes punctuated by angry outbursts and heated exchanges. I can remember sometimes thinking to myself, when the issues seemed particularly intractable, and Congress had tied itself into knots, that these must truly be the worst of times.

But, with the benefit of perspective, I believe that they were, in many ways, the best of times. Being involved in the making of decisions that help move this country forward, is part of the exhilaration that often characterizes service in the Congress. That exhilaration was, for me, always matched by a keen sense of the scope of the responsibility that we shouldered. That this Nation has, for more than 200 years, entrusted to a relatively small number of its citizens the job of governing a large, complex, and diverse society is an act of faith that, for me, has always been a source of marvel.

It is in the shouldering of that responsibility that the current Members of Congress maintain the strength of the tie that binds them, not only to their colleagues of today, but to the James Madisons, Roger Shermans, and Frederick Muhlenbergs of the first Congress as well. This is the forum in which the work of democracy gets done. And it gets done because there exists, in this institution, a tradition of men and women of great ability and dedication who are willing to come together, often at considerable sacrifice to themselves and their families, to serve their country.

As Congress begins its third century, I think it is worth acknowledging that it remains the preeminent legislative body in the history of the world. My association with it has been, with the exception of my family, the single most satisfying association in my life. And I would expect that Members who

will come here decades from now will feel much the same way when their period of service is complete.

I wish the current Members, and those who will follow them, the best of luck in their efforts to grapple with those seemingly insoluble problems with which they will be confronted. If those of us who no longer carry a voting card can ever be of service, I hope the Association of Former Members of Congress will be recognized as an appropriate vehicle.

□ 1040

I want to express again my very deep gratitude for this great distinguished honor that has been conferred upon me.

Thank you very much.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn.

Mr. PREYER (presiding). The Chair again wishes to thank the former Members of the House for their presence here today, and we thank our particular honoree, the gentleman from Massachusetts. He now understands what a pancake feels like after the syrup has been poured over it, or will before the weekend is over.

Before terminating these proceedings, the Chair would like to invite any former Members who have not already responded to their rollcall, to their name, to give their names to the reading clerks, please, for inclusion on the roll.

The Chair thanks all of the other Members, former Members, of Congress for their presence here today, an unusually fit looking group, undoubtedly coming from sufficient time spent in the House gym.

We wish good luck to all of you, and the Chair announces that the House will reconvene at 11 o'clock.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House continued in recess until 11 a.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BONTIOR] at 11 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for 1-minute speeches.

TODAY'S YOUNG WOMEN ARE FIVE TIMES MORE LIKELY TO END UP BEING SOLE SUPPORT OF FAMILIES

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very interesting that the

Department of Labor, the United States Department of Labor tells us that young women in school today are five times more likely than young men in school today to end up being the sole support of their families.

That is a world turned upside down from when I was in school.

Let me do it one more time: A young woman is five times more likely to end up being the sole support of her family in this country today than a young man in school sitting next to her.

What wage do most of those women make? They make the minimum wage; two-thirds of the people making the minimum wage are women and they are often supporting their family.

I certainly hope people vote for the minimum wage bill today. It is the least we can do as we watch the Michael Milken and the greed follies going on around this country. The least we can do is recognize people who are at the minimum wage and hardly making it if they are at all.

FAMILY FARMLAND PRESERVATION ACT

(Mr. SCHULZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, the tradition of family farming in America is being threatened by the spiraling value of farmland in proximity to urban areas. As the value of land rises with increased development, the ability of families to pass their farms onto succeeding generations is being eliminated by enormous estate tax burdens. These taxes are based on the price the land could bring for development purposes, not its value if retained in farming.

Today, I am introducing the Family Farmland Preservation Act. My bill would protect family farmers from incredible estate tax burdens reflecting development value rather than farming value. It would not forgive the estate tax, but allow farmers to postpone payment and reduce the total tax burden for each 5 years a farm remains in production and is kept in the family.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is limited in scope and presents an environmentally sound approach to preserving our open space and the American family farm.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privi-

lege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

NORIEGA STOLE THE ELECTIONS IN PANAMA

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, as an observer in the recent Panamanian elections, it is clear that three things came out of those elections: No. 1, Noriega stole the elections from the Panamanian people. No. 2, there is no support for him at all by the Panamanian people other than his military henchmen. No. 3, I did not see any evidence of anti-Americanism and the United States is not viewed as a negative force.

Whatever the United States does, our obligation is to protect United States citizens and property including the canal and determine if the Panamanian people need our help to carry on the democratic principles.

We should not decide what is best for the Panamanian people but if we are genuinely called upon for help, we should not be afraid to provide help and assistance. There is no question that some of Panama's current problems have been caused by the misguided United States diplomatic and military policy in recent years and we do not go into this situation with totally clean hands. But we must be more than just neutral observers in dealing with the abuse of power by General Noriega.

To paraphrase the Italian poet, Dante: "The deepest place in hell is reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis claim neutrality."

Neutrality cannot be the basis of United States policy when the rights of the Panamanian people are being abused by the dictator Noriega.

GENESEE RIVER PROTECTION ACT OF 1989

(Mr. PAXON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Genesee River Protection Act of 1989 to accompany legislation which my New York colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, is introducing in the other body.

The purpose of this legislation is to protect the scenic beauty and ecological value of the Genesee River under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

The Genesee River and Letchworth State Park located in the very heart of

my 31st Congressional District which I am proud to represent.

Affectionately known as the "Grand Canyon of the East," with cliffs that rise to over 600 feet at some points, this gorge is where the magnificent Genesee River spans some 17 miles as it roars over three major falls, one of which is more than 107 feet high.

The historic Letchworth State Park encompasses over 14,000 acres with boundaries accessed by main entrances in Portageville, Castile, and Perry in Wyoming County and Mount Morris in Livingston County and hosts close to 1 million visitors annually.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to grow up not far from this environmental wonder and after representing that same area during my 6-year tenure as a New York State assemblyman, I am pleased, extremely pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to introduce this legislation, the Genesee River Protection Act of 1989, that will preserve this natural resource for present and future generations to enjoy.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments, which raises the minimum wage for the first time since 1981. Today, in 1989, it is about time that we provide a decent hourly wage for the working men and women of America.

I have always felt strongly that we should do everything possible to make work more financially attractive than welfare. By keeping the minimum wage at \$3.35, we have forced many American workers to work 40 hours a week, and yet earn only \$6,968 per year.

The minimum wage is established by Congress. As a result, there have been no yearly increases for inflation and the real value of the wage today has gone down by almost 30 percent. We establish a variety of social service and employment programs here in Washington, such as the food stamps and supplemental security income programs, and ensure that they will receive inflationary increases. We do not do this for the minimum wage.

There are those who say that increasing the minimum wage will increase inflation. The working poor are not, and never have been the cause of the United States' huge debt burden. To look at inflation and the deficit, and conclude that the working poor are to blame is straining at a gnat while swallowing a camel. Each one of

us here has contributed more to inflation than the working poor.

□ 1110

ARREST NORIEGA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Jimmy Carter said that General Noriega is a crook. He said that the general fraudulently disrupted the election in Panama. Now we all know that. But Jimmy Carter recommended to President Bush that he go slow. Now I have great respect for former President Carter, but one of the reasons, honestly, that he was not reelected, because at times he would just simply go too slow. We do not need a slow motion President. We have a drug smuggler that has been indicted, sitting in Panama, laughing at the United States. We have a \$310 billion defense budget and we do not fund it to provide money for the neighborhood crime watch. Now is the time to use it.

I recommend that President Bush send the Marines to Panama and arrest General Noriega and let the world know America has had it with drug smugglers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). The Chair wishes to remind all guests of the Congress not to express their feelings of approval or disapproval of the proceedings of the Congress, as it is in violation of the rules of the House.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL?

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on a day when the House has little on its schedule, the uninformed observer thinks we have little to do.

Well, what about the dire emergency supplemental? It has been more than 2 weeks since that bill, H.R. 2072, was pulled from the floor.

It has been more than 1 month since the President officially sent up his revisions on April 3, and more like 2 months since we found out what was in them.

It has been more than 4 months since President Reagan sent up the original supplemental requests for this fiscal year.

How can there be a dire emergency if we are sitting around on our hands?

How long does it take to figure out that the overwhelming rejection of the Foley amendment means that the House wants a lean and clean supplemental?

How long does it take to cross out the additional funding for programs that can wait a month for the regular bills?

Mr. Speaker, our veterans, our students, our forest rangers, our workers unemployed because of unfair foreign competition, the Soviet refugees, the southwest African peacekeepers, are waiting.

What are we waiting for?

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to receive the managers appointed by the House of Representatives for the purpose of exhibiting articles of impeachment against Walter L. Nixon, Jr., judge of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, agreeably to the notice communicated to the Senate, and that at the hour of 11 a.m. on Thursday, May 11, 1989, the Senate will receive the honorable managers on the part of the House of Representatives, in order that they may present and exhibit the said articles of impeachment against the said Walter L. Nixon, Jr., judge of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1593

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1593.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THREE THIN DIMES

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, once again the House will be considering legislation to improve the lives of the 8.4 million working Americans who live in poverty. The conference report on the minimum wage which the House will be taking up today, would ensure that the paycheck America's workers bring home will be enough to provide for the basic necessities of life. Can America do any less?

The minimum wage was designed to be a living wage. But, over the last 10 years, its purchasing power has been allowed to decline to its lowest level since 1955. It is no coincidence that as the minimum wage has been allowed to decline over the past 10 years, an increasing number of working Americans are poor and an increasing

number of working Americans are homeless.

Two-thirds of the American public believe that the wage ought to be raised. The problem, Mr. Speaker, comes down to this. Three thin dimes. That is the difference between the Congress and the President of the United States. Thirty cents. Three thin dimes which will make the difference between a living wage and poverty for millions of Americans. Mr. President, we are going to pass this conference report. I hope you will not veto it. Three thin dimes for the poorest working Americans who only want to be able to support themselves and their families. That is what America wants them to do. Let the Members give them an opportunity.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GOVERNMENTWIDE ETHICS ACT OF 1989

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored and privileged by the President to introduce his ethics law reform bill, the Governmentwide Ethics Act of 1989.

This bill is an unprecedented legislative opportunity to restore reason to public debate, to reaffirm common-sense standards of public service, to restore some common sense to government ethics. For that we need some government ethics that make sense.

Citizens have a vested interest in the President's proposal. It is the hope of citizens for easily understood, uniform standards that support public officials in their desire to do the right thing.

Members of Congress also have a vested interest in the President's proposal. Members will recognize the basic fairness and responsiveness to the unique constitutional role of Congress. In the broad, comprehensive approach it provides a starting point that Congress could not reach without the commitment and the cooperation of the President.

The alternative, a failure of this Congress to address and restate clear, simple, uniform standards of public service is unacceptable to the American people.

To my House colleagues I say, the President, on behalf of the American people, has given Members the legislative vehicle we need. President Bush has served in this institution, the House. He knows practices. He knows that here as nowhere else in government the people govern, and the people have spoken.

IN SUPPORT OF MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. I rise in support for the minimum wage bill today. Our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], pointed out that three thin dimes separate Members from the President. I urge my colleagues to support this minimum wage bill and urge the President to sign it, because those three thin dimes amount to \$12 a week, only \$50 a month, for working Americans.

How can we ignore the needs of the working poor in our country when I could stand here, Mr. Speaker, for hours and read off the list of people making over \$1 million a year for their salaries.

□ 1120

Mr. Speaker, I will take the remainder of my 1 minute to read as many of these as I can who are making over \$10 million a year. I am not going to use their names; I would rather go into the numbers instead.

- No. 1, over \$40 million a year;
- No. 2, \$32,135,000 a year;
- No. 3, \$21 million a year;
- No. 4, \$21 million a year;
- No. 5, \$16 million a year;
- No. 6, \$14 million a year;
- No. 7, \$12,960,000 a year;
- No. 8, \$11 million a year;
- No. 9, \$11.5 million a year;
- No. 10, \$11 million a year; and
- No. 11, \$11 million a year.

The list goes on and on. How can we in our society contend that we have any sense of fairness when there is even a debate over the fact that people in our country who work would get an increase of \$12 a week? And that is only a small difference between our legislation and what the President will agree to sign.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members, please, let us not allow this disparity to continue. Support the minimum wage bill today.

NEED FOR FUNDS FOR VETERANS HEALTH CARE IS DIRE AND URGENT

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about funding for veterans programs. The supplemental appropriations bill which was originally scheduled for floor consideration included additional money for compensation and pensions as well as health care. Unfortunately, it also contained a lot of money for a host of other programs which, in my

mind, did not merit the terms "dire or emergency."

The need for increased funding of veterans health care, however, is both dire and urgent. Veterans in Florida are being denied the care they have earned because there is simply not enough money to serve their needs. The longer we deliberate this, the longer these men and women will go without health care that may not be available to them in any other setting.

I urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to reach an agreement that will allow Members to vote on needs that are truly emergencies. Funding for extraneous programs will only hold up passage of legislation which will address the health care needs of our Nation's former service men and women. I understand that a tentative agreement has been reached, and I hope that the committee has recognized the need for a package we can all vote for.

DEFAZIO SAYS OREGON NEEDS ADDITIONAL JUDGE, CITES INCREASE IN CRIME, CASELOADS

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have passed tough new laws. We have obtained more law enforcement officials. We are building more jail cells. President Bush says he may declare a national crime emergency. But all the declarations, laws, and police in the world will not solve our crime problem unless our courts can prosecute, convict, and sentence criminals.

The Oregon Department of Justice says that my State now ranks second in the Nation in the number of illegal drug lab seizures, third in the number of bank robberies, sixth in serious crime, and seventh in robberies.

Our Federal courts are swamped with cases, which leads to delays in indictments, prosecutions, and verdicts, particularly in the Federal court in my district where we are operating only with a magistrate.

Each of Oregon's Federal judges had more than 514 cases during 1988. The Judicial Conference says that there should be no more than 400 cases per judge per year.

We are arresting more criminals, but our courts cannot hear their cases. Law enforcement officials tell me their hands are tied until we reduce the backlog in our courts. We can talk tough about fighting crime until we are blue in the face, but we will have no effect until we give our courts the judges they need to put criminals behind bars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to lend me their support in considering and passing H.R. 2030, which would

authorize a new article III judge for the district of Oregon.

THE TRUE GAUGE OF OUR IRRESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House passed a budget resolution that technically pushes our deficit below \$100 billion and meets Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction targets. But Gramm-Rudman calculations don't tell the real story.

While we claim that the deficit will be only \$100 billion this year, do you know how much our national debt will increase in fiscal year 1990? CBO predicts that when you subtract the trust fund surpluses and add the cost of the savings and loan bailout, the real deficit will be \$264 billion. That's right. The real deficit, the real addition to our Nation's indebtedness, the amount our kids will be paying interest on all their lives, is really two-and-a-half times what the budget resolution says it is.

What good is it to craft a budget agreement that produces a deficit number that has no relation to the budget's impact on the national debt?

This summer, when we are passing a debt limit extension bill that authorizes the Treasury to borrow another \$300 billion or so to get us through fiscal year 1990, ask yourself how real the \$100 billion deficit figure is.

MINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL DESERVES MEMBERS' SUPPORT

(Mr. HOAGLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of excellent arguments presented here today in favor of the minimum wage bill that I hope will pass this afternoon. I would like to join those and dwell on one particular item that particularly concerns me in the proposal that will be before the House this afternoon, and that is that the compromise we have arrived at here in the House of Representatives only restores 86 percent of the loss that has been incurred due to inflation and will be incurred due to inflation since January 1, 1981, when we last increased the minimum wage.

The administration's proposal, coming with the veto threat, would only restore 81 percent of the loss. I think many of us here would like to restore 100 percent of the loss.

I know that in my conservative part of the Midwest, 74 percent of my constituents are in favor of increasing the minimum wage to the level of at least what we have here. I see no justification for a veto in a situation where the compromise we have arrived at here

again only restores 86 percent of the loss over the last 9 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report, and I certainly urge the President to sign the bill.

SUPPORT A DECENT MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, the working people of America deserve a fair and decent minimum wage. For too long, our country's minimum wage level has remained stagnant, while the continuing creep of inflation has eroded its value and undercut the buying power of millions of hard working people.

Today we have the opportunity to change that, a chance to approve a long-overdue rejuvenation of our basic wage standard.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support that conference report on raising the minimum wage. Most importantly, I urge the President to listen to the voices of millions of deserving American workers, and sign this bill. They deserve those "three thin dimes."

SUPPORT URGED FOR CONFERENCE REPORT ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

(Mr. LEHMAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to show their strong support for the conference report on the Fair Labor Standards Act. Let us show our commitment to the working men and women of America by raising the minimum wage. Let us say today that it is simply no longer acceptable for a man or a woman in this country to work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, and still live in poverty.

This is a modest bill—three thin dimes. The administration claims that those dimes would cause job loss and high inflation—three dimes over 3 years. If history is our teacher, it is well documented that raising the minimum wage will cause no significant job loss or inflation.

Where is the concern for what inflation has done to people on the minimum wage? What this bill does is to restore the purchasing power of a minimum wage that is so eroded that it only buys \$2.56 of today's goods and services.

There is more to this issue than just numbers. We are talking about restoring basic fairness to the workplace. No one in this country should work full

time and live in poverty. No one should work full time and not be able to have a roof over their head. It is ridiculous to think that a head of household earning the minimum wage has absolutely no hope of supporting his or her family. In addition, it is imperative to provide an incentive for people to get off public assistance and enter the work force. By raising the minimum wage, we can accomplish this.

Mr. Speaker, the President would cut the capital gains tax for the rich today, but he would veto this legislation because of three dimes over 3 years. I say to the Members, let us draw a line in the dirt and stand our ground.

REMEMBERING THOSE WHO WILL NOT GRADUATE THIS SPRING

(Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, during the next several weeks, as Americans triumph in the graduation of loved ones from high school and college, this Nation needs to also think for a moment about the young people left behind, who, for whatever reason, have either dropped out of school or didn't have the chance to go in the first place. It is a tragedy that these young people will never reach their full potential. More alarming, a recent report by the Joint Economic Committee shows their numbers are growing.

This report, which I urge my colleagues to read, singled out education as, "perhaps the most prominent area where our Nation's shortcomings threaten to impose enormous long-term costs."

The committee found that we have a dropout rate between 40 and 50 percent for minority students and that some 13 percent of all 17-year-old Americans cannot read, write, or count. Many young people are unable to afford higher education. Tuition at America's colleges and universities has outpaced family income at a rate of 5 to 1 during this decade. Not surprisingly, college enrollment is down.

The future of this Nation is filled with too many challenges and too many opportunities to abandon so many young people. For their sake and for the sake of our future, we must do better.

□ 1130

ANOTHER REASON TO SUPPORT THE MINIMUM-WAGE CONFERENCE REPORT—ITS IMPACT ON WOMEN

(Mr. SABO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, and Members, I rise today in support of the minimum-wage conference report. There are many reasons to support it. Let me focus on one reason which is a little more narrow than others, its impact on young women, particularly on young women who are furthering their education.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my observation that there is real distinction in our society in the wages that a young woman can earn in comparison to a young man. A young woman who is trying to earn money to go on to college or to earn a few dollars while she is in school suffers immensely because of our wage inequity. This bill will help that.

Mr. President, as part of a kinder, gentler society, please sign this very modest increase in the minimum wage bill.

THE HISTORY OF THE MINIMUM-WAGE DEBATE

(Mr. NAGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the minimum wage.

I sometimes think on occasion the debate that we have on the floor of this House actually comes out of the history of the walls around us, that what is said today has actually been said on many occasions before, and specifically with the minimum wage it is true. We hear dire processes again, as we did when the thing was first established, that great gloom and doom will happen to the countryside if we enact the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my preparation today I went back and looked to see what the original debate on the minimum wage said about it, and I was struck with the similarity of then and today. On December 14, 1937, for example, one Member rose in this body and probably stood in the place I now stand, and that Member predicted the establishment of a minimum wage rate of 40 cents an hour would replace our constitutional form of democracy with a despotic form of government, establish a dominion over industry by labor, and drain our countryside of farmworkers who would surely flock to the cities for such high wages.

Mr. Speaker, it did not happen then, and it will not happen today. We should not be misled by those who oppose decency for the American working people by giving them a decent wage. It has worked in this country for 50 years, and it will work again.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass, and the President should sign, the minimum wage bill later today.

PRESIDENT BUSH—THE BIGGEST OBSTACLE TO ENACTMENT OF A DECENT MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. FORD of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$4.55 by October 1991.

This bill is solidly within a 50-year-old tradition in the United States, a tradition that holds that Americans who work should not be poor. The minimum wage is a social compact initiated by FDR in the New Deal that says to every American: If you work full time, year round, you will be able to support a small family without resort to welfare.

That tradition and that social compact are threatened today. At today's minimum wage of \$3.35 an hour, no one can support a family. The poverty line of 1989 is \$11,130 for a family of three. Full-time, year-round earnings at today's minimum wage are only \$6,968—far below that poverty line.

President Bush is the biggest obstacle to enactment of a decent minimum wage. He wants to raise the minimum, he says, but not so high that it would lift a working family out of poverty.

In George Bush's version of a kinder and gentler America, the minimum wage would be—as he puts it—"not a penny more" than \$4.25 an hour, and the three \$0.30 increases to get it there would be phased in over 3 years. By the time the \$4.25 figure took effect in 1992 it would fall dismally short of a living wage: \$8,856 would be more than \$4,000 below the estimated 1992 poverty line of \$12,890 for a family of three.

President Bush's position on the minimum wage has to be viewed in the light of his position of the capital gains tax. To understand his view of fairness and economic justice, you have to contrast his treatment of the working poor with his treatment of the investing rich.

President Bush's capital gains tax proposal would give the wealthiest 1 percent of American taxpayers, those earning more than \$225,000 a year, an average tax cut of \$19,800—more than twice the entire annual income a worker would earn under the Bush minimum wage proposal.

The working poor would get "not a penny more" than 69 percent of a poverty level income. The wealthiest of the wealthy would get tax breaks big enough to hire two minimum wage workers each to take care of their gardens or to do their laundry.

Is this the Bush full employment program?

AT LEAST THE REPUBLICANS ARE EMBARRASSED ABOUT THEIR POSITION

(Mr. FRANK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, people sometimes ask if there are differences left between the parties. Today my colleagues see very graphically that there are.

Mr. Speaker, there has been an absence of Republican participation this morning. I will give them credit for the fact that they are somewhat embarrassed about the position they have to defend because it is a position that begrudges hard-working people a chance to earn a barely minimum wage. The President has apparently imposed on them the discipline that says, "Don't you dare vote that the poorest people in this society ought to make more than \$4.25 an hour," an amount that everyone, including the President, understands is wholly inadequate to support a family.

Mr. Speaker, the position the administration is urging on its Republican followers is, "Don't let the poorest people in this society, those most disadvantaged by inadequate education, by the ravages of discrimination, by other problems that they have encountered, don't let them make more than 4.25 an hour as a matter of national policy."

That seems to me a tragic situation, and, as I said, I acknowledge the fact that my colleagues on the other side are at least embarrassed about that position not to take the opportunity to articulate it.

Mr. Speaker, the \$4.55 that we are voting is also inadequate. Unfortunately it is probably the best we can do in this situation. We have an economy that has worked well. We have prosperity that benefits most of us. It would be wholly unfortunate if the great majority of us who are doing better than we have been begrudge the poorest and the weakest among us the chance to earn a little bit more of a pittance than they have been earning.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the conference report is passed overwhelmingly.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO DEBT FOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, much concern has arisen in recent years about the magnitude of Mexico's external debt to the United States. Both the

Baker plan and the Brady plan have addressed Mexico's debt problem by encouraging banks to refinance the commercial debt owed to them by Mexico. At the same time, we have seen numerous deficiencies along the United States-Mexico border, involving issues including public works, poor health services, and serious environmental problems.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Government must demonstrate true leadership in the effort to relieve the Mexican debt, while assisting border development. Mexico currently owes \$2 billion dollars to our Federal Government. I will introduce legislation in the near future which establishes a debt for development plan, in which our Government will exchange Mexican debt dollars for development projects along the United States-Mexico border. Through this plan, regional banks will finance essential projects to our border.

By initiating a debt for development plan with Mexico, our Government will take the first step in its commitment to assist our neighbor and create the North American alliance.

□ 1140

SUPPORT CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H.R. 2

(Mr. MARTINEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have extended our hand to the administration by compromising on the training wage, which should actually be called the sub-sub minimum wage, since the current minimum wage itself is sub-minimum to what a family actually needs to survive. I have nothing against a training wage that provides people with decent wages and long-term employment. But I do not believe that it takes anyone 60 days to learn how to make a bed, sweep a floor or flip burgers—that is what this training wage really is.

Mr. Bush says that he will veto any legislation with a minimum wage above \$4.25 an hour. Our bill mandates 30 more cents for workers. Will this be overly burdensome to industry? No!

The State of California unilaterally mandated a minimum wage 90 cents higher than the current Federal minimum wage. No jobs have been lost in my State as a result of this action. Indeed, California's economy continues to boom.

In short, what we are talking about is a difference of 30 cents. It is the least we can do.

I am not happy with the compromises we have been compelled to make as a result of the administration's intransigence. But we must at least do this much for our working men and

women. I urge my colleagues to support the conference agreement on H.R. 2.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2, FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1989

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restore the minimum wage to a fair and equitable rate, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 8, 1989.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989.

This conference report represents a good faith attempt to offer a reasonable, yet meaningful adjustment in the Federal minimum wage.

While this measure is less than what we had originally hoped for, it is an essential step toward ensuring a fair and livable wage for the lowest paid workers.

I am disappointed by the President's threat of a veto. Congress has compromised enough on this bill. When we started this process 2 years ago, we proposed what I considered a very conservative increase, to \$4.65, over 3 years.

Now, we have moved lower and added other provisions to satisfy administration and business demands. The President should sign this bill. If he wants to flex his muscle with a veto, do not pick on the lowest paid workers in society.

The real value of the minimum wage has declined by almost 40 percent since 1981. In order to maintain its former purchasing power, the minimum should be at \$4.57 per hour today.

We have offered an olive branch to the President by including a 60-day, limited training wage, which goes against the very grain of the concept of Federal labor standards in the first place. This was a huge concession. Why should we legislate a poverty wage or legitimize a training wage that encourages exploitation and cutthroat competition?

The real opposition to Fair Labor Standards is not the President, but a small group of selfish business interests, who are willing to spend millions of dollars on phony studies and carefully orchestrated editorial and ad campaigns.

Their arguments today are recycled versions of those used each time we have legislated an increase since the original Fair Labor Standard Act of 1938. Then they said a minimum wage of 25 cents would create unemployment, result in millions of business failures, and increase inflation. Empirical evidence proved them wrong then, and continues to prove such misinformation inaccurate now.

To believe their prophecy of disaster and claim of leadership of the poor, disadvantaged masses, is to believe in the absurd. In their rhetoric, they are the saviors of the low-skilled, the minorities, the young, who will face astronomical job losses if their compassionate employers, who hire them at subminimal levels of decency, are required to pay a fair, living wage.

To accept this foolishness is to accept these selfish interests as the anointed biblical apostles, designated "to bring good news to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted . . . to proclaim liberty to captives, new sight to the blind, and to set the down-trodden free," (St. Luke, chapter 4, 18th verse).

If you believe the opposition's main concern is the welfare of minimum wage workers, then you must believe in the Tooth Fairy, the Easter Bunny and that Peter Pan never grows up.

I ask my colleagues to put aside the grandstanding, and don't let the opponents' exaggerated, unsubstantiated accusations of economic armageddon dissuade you from improving the economic conditions of the least advantaged among us. History shows that an increase in the minimum wage is good for low-wage workers, good for business, good for our entire economy and in practice results in more jobs, not less.

I urge my colleagues to support this very modest and reasonable offer by voting in favor of the conference report on H.R. 2.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week we brought to the floor of the House the Vocational Education bill. It was built on compromise and cooperation, but today we are being asked to adopt a conference report on the minimum wage, and regrettably, this is strictly a product of bipartisan politics. Throughout the minimum wage debate and, yes, again this morning, I have heard the President criticized for not compromising, for sending an ultimatum to the Hill.

Well, let me tell you, folks, you heard about three thin dimes awhile ago, that we are only three thin dimes apart. The President came nine thick dimes to meet the majority side, nine thick dimes.

Do not tell me that the President did not compromise. Nine thick dimes is a long way from three thin dimes. Let me tell you, those three thin dimes are surely on thin ice.

Just once, let us be honest and talk about who has really been willing to compromise and who has not.

□ 1150

There was no compromise on the part of the majority with H.R. 2. It was streamrolled through the committee, the House floor, marked up, subcommittee, full committee, brought to the House in a 3-week period, and then we had the Ridge-Robinson substitute, so-called. Do not tell me that that is a compromise, because that is about as phony as a \$7 bill, and all of the Members know that, that it was brought here simply because they realized they did not have the votes to go with H.R. 2 as it came from the committee.

When we went to conference, was there compromise? Of course there was no compromise. There might have been a little out in the hall between the majority of the one body and the majority of the other body, but I will guarantee that there was not any compromise in relationship to what the President was interested in and what the majority wanted. The only compromise, as I said, was made between the same party members from the House and the other body out in the hall, and that was not much compromise either.

Let me now talk a little about this training provision. I have been hearing about this magnificent 60-day training provision. Come on, folks, people can read; people can understand. There is no 60-day training provision in the bill that we have before us today. Who is trying to kid who? Sixty days? First of all, if one worked 60 days for somebody, maybe 500 different employees, they are not included in the first place. One could work 20 minutes for one employer, a quarter of a day for another, 2 days for somebody else, and eventually they have 60 days and so they are not in any training wage whatsoever, but, boy, have they really been trained; they have jumped all over the place to get their 60 days. It sounds like 40 quarters in Social Security—60 days. So there is no 60-day training wage at all.

I will be the first to admit that the one that I presented can use some fine-tuning. I will admit that. But let us not try to convince the public that somehow or other we put a 60-day training wage in here when we know very well there is not. Who out there would fit in that category? There is

not a soul. There is not a soul out there who has not had 60 days of employment somewhere, and so we have eliminated them. It prohibits the percentage of employment hours that can be spent on training from exceeding 25 percent. It suggests that the training period be at least 30 days, but above all, it excludes agricultural employees, and then as I said, it excludes anyone who has a cumulative work period of 60 days, not with any one employer or anything of that nature, just any employment for 60 days.

Mr. Speaker, that must be the part of this conference report that the other side is talking about when they talk about a compromise. That must be the only thing that I can find, and that compromise, Members, I hate to keep saying it, is about as phony as they come.

We have not had a minimum wage increase from 1981 to 1988. I have heard that over and over again. We are for one, but let me tell the Members that during that time we went from 600,000 people, heads of households, working at minimum wage in poverty, down to 300,000. We did not do anything during that period in relationship to minimum wage, and we went the right direction. We are now going to try to do something about it and see whether we can go the rest of the way.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to stop engaging in partisan politics. The longer workers are deprived of a wage increase, the more likely it is that that wage increase will not come about, and if we are going to just have this partisan rhetoric that we have seen and this noncompromising effort on the part of the majority, then nothing will happen.

They know it will be vetoed, I know it will be vetoed; they know it will be sustained, I know it will be sustained. So let us get on with the business of passing a minimum wage increase as a compromise where one person has come nine thick dimes to the other side's three phony thin dimes, and then we can get on to the real business that we need to do such as job training.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote against the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Standards of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2. This report represents an honest effort to help our lowest paid wage earners as well as to accommodate the concerns of many of

the critics of the minimum wage, first among them President Bush.

As a longtime supporter of a raise in the minimum wage I welcome the new President's willingness to support an increase. After 8 years of silence and stonewalling from the White House I had hoped that with a new administration this important issue would finally be resolved. I believe many of my colleagues were also encouraged by the promise of cooperation. Unfortunately, although our committee and the majority in both the House and Senate have compromised, we are disappointed that since that action we have not heard from the President nor has he offered leadership on this issue.

Yes, Mr. Bush has proposed a minimum wage increase, and, yes, that is certainly a step in the right direction. But there is one thing on which we can all agree, no legislative proposal is perfect from the outset, including the President's. The legislative process is one that requires give and take. Democracy survives because we work out our differences instead of fighting over them. The President, however, adamantly refused to talk of compromise, he has said "take it or leave it" to the Congress and then turned his back on the process and our compromise.

This legislation which passed by both Houses of Congress by a bipartisan majority takes into consideration the concerns of many different Members. In our bill we have included a training wage, an issue that still troubles many of the Members from this side of the aisle. We have increased the tip credit, the small business exemption, and we have lowered the rate of increase from our committee bill. Democrats and Republicans have worked together to write this legislation in the hopes of accommodating many different points of view. Yet even with all this work, the President has not responded to our efforts.

On TV and in the newspapers we see this conflict presented as a major test of political will. The commentators often ask who will win in the end. What so many people do not understand is that there will be few winners in this battle. The political benefits of this fight will be fleeting. Unfortunately, the most lasting effect that this battle will have will be upon the millions of people who make up America's working poor.

It will be these people who will be asked to go on working and sacrificing every day. For the ninth year in a row the message to them is, "Don't expect to see any more relief or greater reward for your efforts." Once again these people will have been victims of partisan posturing. There may be no relief this year because Washington is too occupied with business as usual.

Four million American workers, many of them just barely getting by, are waiting for an answer. We must not let this opportunity pass.

I personally hope the President will favorably review what we have forged after a 4-year effort and find the compassion and wisdom to join in our effort to increase the minimum wage from \$3.35 an hour to \$3.85 this October and to \$4.25 in October 1990 and a final step to \$4.55 on October 1, 1991. I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

□ 1200

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, we are at the beginning stages of a debate that is probably not going to be a very fun debate. Those Members of our body who propose increasing the minimum wage, despite the fact that it will destroy jobs across the Nation, and legislate away the right of the working poor to remain working, are going to argue that compassion is on their side of the argument. That is not correct. Mr. Speaker, compassion without understanding is cruel and mean-spirited, and the only compassion that is behind this proposal to destroy the right to work for the working poor is a compassion with its eyes closed to the fact of the matter, and that has been the manner in which we have approached this process from start to finish.

It will be said that they offered to compromise and others did not, and that is also not true. The President has offered a compromise with nine fat dimes in it, and the President's offer has been rejected out of hand.

It will be said that we do not have a more compassionate alternative, and that is not true. The fact of the matter is a compassionate policy would leave the working poor on the job, free to reach for more and better work in their life, and support them with increased income by which they can feed and care for their children, by which they might be able to reach for their tuition and their training. That is not what we are going to vote on here today.

I am going to ask my colleagues in this House, who will be thoughtful and who will care for the rights of the working men and women of America, to vote no on this proposal today. Save those jobs, give those folks a chance to get started in the world of work. Then when the President vetoes this outlandish proposal, I am going to ask my colleagues to come back and sustain that veto, and then join with the President in demanding that this Congress entertain a serious consideration of a proposal like that offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

When we are told, Mr. Speaker, that it is not within the jurisdiction of our committee, let us respond by saying the working men and women of America that voted us into office did not vote us to a committee, they voted us to look at every dimension of public policy that will have an effect on their life.

This is the wrong bill to bring to the floor, Mr. Speaker. It is a bill that is cruel and mean-spirited precisely to the working poor.

Who will benefit? Union wage negotiators will stand on the dead, beaten, battered bodies of those poor, abused, unskilled, untrained working men and women of America.

Vote no.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2.

I do so with some reservation. Not because I do not believe that a minimum wage of \$4.55 by 1991 with a new, 60-day, new hire wage is fair. I believe it is fair and justified. It simply restores the purchasing power of the minimum wage and it takes an historic step in providing a new hire wage for this first time.

My reservation, therefore, is not over the substance of the conference report but over the breakdown in the usual negotiating process between the executive and legislative branch.

First, I want to applaud and thank President Bush for taking the first bold step in this process. He put forward a plan for a 90-cent increase over 3 years and rejecting appeals to battle any increase. He offered this initiative over the opposition of many within his own party—many who didn't even want to discuss minimum wage, let alone increase it. With his proposal, the President demonstrated his compassion and his sense of fairness. Second, I want to acknowledge the willingness of many in this Chamber to reduce their goals, \$5.05, \$4.65 what have you, and to provide, for the first time, a new hire wage which has been an anathema to many. Unfortunately, the other Chamber did nothing to contribute to this process. By virtually passing the House bill, no opportunity was created for a grand compromise and politics reigns over policy.

My colleagues, I still believe, however, that this Chamber took a valid first step toward such a bipartisan compromise by reducing the wage increase by 10 cents, or 25 percent of the difference, by providing for the first-time ever new hire wage and by increasing and expanding the small business exemption.

Unfortunately, the stalemate we sought to break continues. No negotiators were appointed, no negotiations took place. The administration's offer

was said to be their final offer. My friends, we don't treat our worst enemies this way. We do not refuse to negotiate with trading partners or military adversaries. We negotiate with the whole world, but regrettably, on this issue, not with one another.

The arguments against the minimum wage have been the same since the Fair Labor Standards Act was approved in 1938. It is a valid concern over the potential loss of jobs. I will not deny that some jobs will be lost—although the numbers produced by the Department of Labor are based on outdated assumptions and are highly inflated. But since 1938, the Congress and past Presidents have been able to agree on what is a fair wage floor for any hard-working American.

In my view, the real argument this morning is over the value of work. What is the minimum value of a day of hard day's work and does it have more value than welfare or the risks of crime? Does this Congress believe that guaranteeing a minimum standard of living to anyone who works, good public policy? Or should we, through stalemate or by design, allow the minimum wage to decline in relative value until it is meaningless in terms of providing an incentive to work? Remember, the current minimum wage is worth \$2.52 in 1981 dollars due to increases in the cost of living and it is moving downward. In current dollars, it would take \$4.58 to restore the value of \$3.35 in 1981. Clearly, \$4.25 falls short of restoring the minimum wage to the poverty level for a family of three.

Yes, I know the marketplace determines the value of work. But, the Government has traditionally stepped in to protect the interest of its citizens and to provide minimal protection. We've done it with the minimum wage since 1938.

My colleagues, the conference report before us today does not increase the minimum wage—it simply restores it to the historically acceptable levels. It includes a new hire wage for the first time. It increases the small business exemption. It's reasonable and it's fair. It deserves your support.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is regrettable. Everyone knows that the President will veto it and the veto will be sustained. The result will be no minimum wage increase at all, and no other action to really help the working poor. This is a futile exercise in politics. The proponents of this conference report are trying only to score a few political points, but I doubt that even that effort will succeed.

What we should be doing here is trying to figure out how to really help the working poor. That is the supposed purpose of a minimum wage increase. But the truth is, I believe, that a minimum wage is a terribly crude tool for helping the working poor.

It actually hurts the poor through job losses and inflation.

Most of the people it helps are not poor—they are secondary earners from middle-class families. And most of those who are working poor family heads get no direct help from it because they are already capable of earning at least \$4.55 but remain poor because of their large families.

Despite all that, the President has offered to accept 70 percent of what the minimum wage proponents originally wanted, together with provisions to minimize the loss of jobs. It is a generous offer, but those who claim to be minimum wage proponents have chosen to spurn it. They could have had most of what they asked, but they have chosen to play politics instead.

When this exercise is all over with, I hope we will return to the real question of how to help the working poor.

In the first place, I think the other side would be wise to accept the President's offer on the minimum wage. But beyond that, I think it is far more important to move on a tax credit approach to the problem. Almost everyone now agrees that is desirable, regardless of what happens on the minimum wage. It is the most direct, most targeted, and most efficient way to help working poor families with children. With a tax credit approach, we can provide direct wage supplements only to those who need them, and in proportion to their need as determined by the number and even the ages of their children.

The President, besides his minimum wage offer, has advanced a tax credit proposal also. The gentleman from New York, [Mr. Downey] and I myself, and several other Members have put related proposals on the table.

I understand that the recent budget agreement assumes that money will be spent in this area. So let's get down to work and put together an agreement on an expanded earned income tax credit adjusted for family size.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, besides providing income support to the working poor, the President has also argued that we should be helping them improve their job skills so they can move up in the labor force on their own. In other words, we should supplement current earnings according to need, and we should help people improve their future earnings. In fact, there is plenty for us to do. Let's quit playing politics and get down to work.

□ 1210

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, 8 million American workers are not asking for handouts today; they are asking for a helping hand. But the problem is that Congress has been brainwashed over the years by think-tank economists to believe that an increase in the minimum wage is going to hurt our country.

I say "baloney" and I say today I have never seen an economist in a soup line or in an unemployment line. Maybe it would be good for them if they were in a soup line. Then they would know what it would be like to try and keep a family together on \$3.35 an hour.

Congress has been subsidizing American industry with food stamps and housing vouchers and, man, they love it. They love it so much they ship the \$15 per hour jobs overseas and they keep the \$3.35 an hour job for Uncle Sam.

I say today Congress must act. Our American workers should ride the elevator today because they have been getting the shaft too long. Today is not a day in Washington to read lips; today is a day to deal with the pocketbook.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is not too much more we can say about this. We can talk about this conference report that probably could have been done by a FAX machine; \$4.55 for the House, \$4.55 for the Senate, agreed, \$4.55, and then on through.

The think I want to talk about in the time I have is this three thin-dime argument. We are not talking about three thin dimes. If we want to nickel and dime this issue, let us talk about the 90 cents between the \$3.35 and the \$4.25 which is what this issue is about.

The President came 70 percent of the way.

If we want to do what I assume the minimum wage is supposed to do, which is to raise the wage base around the country for all of those millions of people who do not collect it and never will, \$4.25 will do that. You have got what you want. But if you vote to sustain this conference report and send it to the President and have him veto it, you just delay the process.

You are hurting the people you are trying to help.

This is not labor policy, it is not economic policy, it is not social policy; it is politics. And the people that are getting hurt are the people who could be earning \$4.25 right now if we were not playing this game. If we were not insisting on a 60-day meaningless train-

ing wage which for some reason exempts agricultural workers—and I do not know why, I guess nobody feels they need training—but it is absurd to think that 60 days of cumulative employment is any kind of a training wage at all. This is a paperboy empowerment act. It means nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the House to vote down this conference report. Let us go back to where we belong, \$4.25.

The President has meant what he said. Let us get that bill back here and pass it and do something about the minimum wage.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOLTER].

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 2, the conference report on the minimum wage increase.

As a nation, we have seriously neglected to provide our lowest paid workers with an acceptable standard of living. Not since 1981 has the minimum wage been increased. Since that time, the purchasing power of the \$3.35 per hour wage has diminished drastically. Had the minimum wage kept pace with inflation, it would now stand at \$4.57.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is a national disgrace. All this time our lowest paid wage earners have continually lost ground in their fight to make a decent living for themselves and their families. They must be fairly compensated. Is this too much to ask? I say no.

This is a fair package. Smaller businesses and small farms are exempt from provisions of this bill. History has shown that warnings of decreased employment due to increases in the minimum wage do not hold true. The Nation as a whole can only benefit from enactment of this legislation.

This issue should not be one of partisanship. This issue is one of fairness and equity. I urge my colleagues to give this bill the full support that it deserves.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just get sick and tired of listening to these bleeding hearts who are concerned about the loss of jobs on the part of people that would raise the minimum wage to \$4.55 an hour over a 3-year period.

It has some similarity between this position and the people who control the minority, the majority in South Africa. When you talk about sanctions, they say one of the reasons why we should not impose sanctions in order that those people can have some sense of democracy, some semblance of democracy, it is that we will hurt the people we are trying to help.

This echo is something that is really bugging me. It is hogwash.

I was one and I am in the distinct position of having been one who was a

recipient in 1938 when the first minimum wage went into effect, the Fair Labor Standards Act, 40 cents an hour. I received a 15-cents-an-hour wage increase.

The same argument was used then that is being used now that it would hurt the people who we are trying to help.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], a member of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there is a hallmark we have tried to reach and maintain for minimum wage. Following the passage of minimum wage more than half a century ago, it was decided that in order to continue to have good wages bubble up into the American economy and to protect workers at the lowest level, that minimum wage ought to be about one-half of the average nonsupervisory wage in this country.

We have maintained that through the years pretty well. In fact, in the 1950's and 1960's, in those great economic times, we actually had a minimum wage that was slightly above that hallmark of half of the other wages in the United States.

However, today we have fallen way below that standard. Today the minimum wage is only 39 percent of the average wage in the United States. And what is worse, the bill before us is so moderate that after the third increase envisioned by this bill, the minimum wage will have only reached 41 percent of the average wage in the United States.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we are voting on the conference report. I think we all have to recognize there is no compromise here, that there has not been a compromise from the proponents of increasing the minimum wage since the day we started. The bottom line is what is in this conference report is a plain vanilla, 1934-style old way of thinking about minimum wage. The bottom line is it will cost at least 650,000 new jobs per year, the very people that we want to bring into the work force to help them become productive members of society get that first job and move up in the economic ladder, 650,000 of those new entrants into the work force will be denied that job every year, the first year and every year subsequently, and will be doomed into a life of unemployment and poverty.

Now what this House ought to do today is say "no" to this conference report. This conference report is not only not a compromise, it is the same

tired old 1934-style increasing minimum wage and throwing people out of work that we have been doing since the 1930's.

Now is there a way to raise the minimum wage without costing those large number of jobs? Yes, there is. Is there a way to compromise this issue? Yes, there is.

President Bush has come 90 percent of the way, has offered a compromise, but his bottom line is neither he, nor should this House, compromise in a way that costs jobs. President Bush has offered a new-hire wage, has offered a package of minimum wage legislation that by the introduction of permitting a new-hire into an employer, permitting that new-hire to get his or her feet wet, to understand something about the job, to come into a job at the current minimum wage of \$3.35 an hour and be a new-hire and get that first job as a new entrant to that employment.

□ 1220

President Bush has offered that training wage or that new higher wage as an effort to compromise. He has offered a higher minimum wage as a compromise that many Members would never have thought about offering. But the proponents of the minimum wage have refused to compromise, have refused to negotiate, have refused to even discuss anything different other than what has been proposed from the very beginning based on old style and based on the old laws.

Should there be a compromise? Yes. Do we know what the compromise is? The compromise is what President Bush has offered as a compromise. It is not what he wanted originally, it is not everything he wanted, but it comes 90 percent of the way for the proponents of a minimum wage increase to get what they say they want, which is an increase in the minimum wage, but it also does it in a way in which young people and new entrants into the work force will be not denied that first job.

There can be no further compromise that throws people out of work. President Bush has offered the compromise. The proponents ought to accept it.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished to hear that the compromise is what the President wants. What if the compromise would be what I, personally, want? That is not the way the ballgame is played.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an increase in the minimum wage, which is represented by the conference agreement offered in the House today.

As we know, it has been 8 years since the minimum wage was raised to a

level that actually represents what President Roosevelt described as a "fair day's pay for a fair day's work." Since 1981 prices have increased by 39 percent, while the value of minimum wage slipped to a mere \$2.64. Today that amount places a family of three more than 29 percent below the poverty line. In 1989, a minimum wage worker must work more than an hour to purchase a carton of milk in order to feed his child, and more than 3 weeks to pay the rent at current market prices. In 1992, the purchasing power of the current minimum wage would do more to institutionalize poverty than any other vehicle.

As U.S. Representatives, we have a duty to serve the interest of all people: the working poor as well as the rich. By refusing to raise the minimum wage to a rate that is fair and equitable, we ignore the interest of those citizens most in need. In other words, by compromising with the President any further, I believe that we not only compromise our ideals but our oath of office: To ensure domestic tranquility and promote the general welfare. In addition, by vetoing this agreement, Mr. Bush is refusing to abide by his campaign promise of establishing a kinder and gentler nation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

The President came 70 percent of the way to the majority's proposal. Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania on my side of the aisle said we do not treat enemies that way, we do not treat trading partners that way. I surely hope we do not. I do not want to come 70 percent of the way to enemies, and I do not want to come 70 percent of the way to trading partners, and I hope we never do that, but the President did. He came 70 percent to the majority, 60-day training wage is written in it, no one can qualify. The purpose of the bill is to bargain for those who are way above the minimum, and to do that nicely at \$4.25, so I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the longer we engage in partisan politics, the longer workers are deprived of a wage increase. Let us accept the President's proposal of \$4.25, and move on to the other issues that are important such as job training.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the ranking minority member would yield to a question. The statement is being made that the President has compromised already, that he has come 70-some-odd percent of the way toward reaching a compromise. I would like to know where was he originally if he has come from someplace up to \$4.25. Was he below \$4 an hour?

Mr. GOODLING. He did not propose a minimum wage increase. When

Members proposed 4.60, he came to 4.25. So it was 3.35 to 4.25. That is mighty good.

Mr. HAWKINS. The answer is, he came from zero to \$4.25 an hour?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President has said as a matter of principle he must veto a bill which gives an additional 30 cents increase in the minimum wage to workers. At the same time the President has a bill before Members which is asking Members to vote for \$157 billion, that is \$157 billion to bail out the banking industry; \$157 billion for the banks, and he will not give 30 cents for the workers, minimum wage workers who have not had a raise in 8 years, the longest period in history. Inflation has gone up 40 percent in that period. Rents have gone up 43 percent. The cost of public transportation has gone up 36 percent. Health care, 57 percent. All together, the minimum wage is worth about \$1.50 less than what it was in 1981. This is the lowest it has been in 30 years.

This modest bill will not make up what minimum wage workers have lost due to our inaction. Minimum wage workers will still be working, however, making about 69 cents an hour less in real terms than they were 8 years ago after we complete the increases, if we go to \$4.50 an hour.

I urge my colleagues to vote "No" on the \$157 billion on the banks and vote "Yes" to give the workers an extra 30 cents.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, to me it is unbelievable that George Bush has decided to use the full weight of the Presidency to keep our poorest workers from earning an additional 30 cents per hour. The President claims he is worried about the inflationary impact of this 30 cents. With that attitude, the minimum wage would still be 40 cents an hour because we never would have raised it because we would have been worried that it was inflationary.

I say if the President is so worried about the economy, why not do something about the hostile takeovers? If he is so worried about the economy, why does he not do something about a national energy policy? If he is so worried about the economy, what is he going to do about the waste and fraud in the Pentagon?

But I will tell Members something. The President has drawn the line at 30 cents, so let us put things into perspective.

The top two executives of Walt Disney made a grand total of \$72 million last year. What is that per hour, my friends? Fourteen thousand, four

hundred per hour. The President never said that was inflationary. The top two executives of RJR Nabisco had to scrape by on a mere \$43 million. That is only \$8,600 per hour, and I did not hear the President say that that was inflationary. The chairman of Exxon, he is doing such a great job, he made \$1.4 million last year. No one said that was inflationary. In 1988, average total compensation for executive increases in the annual Business Week survey topped \$2 million for the first time.

□ 1230

The average compensation of a CBO has gone up 300 percent since 1980, and the minimum wage has not risen 1 cent since 1981. There are a lot of great executives in the United States of America, and I wish them well, but if they are able to earn all that money, the people at the bottom of the ladder have a right to 30 cents.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] for her very succinct remarks in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise without reservation in strong support of this conference report on the minimum wage.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2, legislation to increase the minimum wage to \$4.55 an hour over the next 3 years. It has been 8 long years since the last increase in the minimum wage. The current minimum wage of \$3.35 an hour is only 35 percent of the average wage in this Nation, the lowest it has ever been since the first minimum wage was enacted 51 years ago. Never before in the history of the minimum wage has so much time passed without an increase.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of minimum wage workers are adults; most are women or minorities. Many are single heads of households, struggling to support families. These are the people we call the "working poor." And I find it unconscionable that, here in America, the richest Nation in the world, we have hard-working women and men who are condemned to a life of poverty.

Our current minimum wage is not a living wage. And unless we act today, unless we vote to increase the minimum wage, the working poor of this Nation will simply fall farther and farther behind.

Today we have the opportunity to bring fairness and dignity back to the lives of our minimum wage workers, and to take a step toward eliminating the need to use that terrible phrase, "the working poor." I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today we are voting on a responsible, modest increase in the minimum wage.

This conference report is the product of many compromises negotiated over several years. As first introduced in 1987, the legislation would have indexed the minimum wage

so it would automatically increase over time. A later version of the bill raised the minimum wage to \$5.05.

But to meet the concerns raised by businesses and some Members of Congress, the Democratic leadership compromised. This year the minimum wage bill as introduced contained no provisions to index the wage and reduced the increase to \$4.65. Since January advocates of a higher minimum wage have again compromised, this time by reducing the increase another 10 cents and creating a new training wage.

So does the final product increase the minimum wage too much? No. Since 1981, inflation has reduced the wage's value by 37 percent. This bill increases the minimum wage just enough to keep the wage's purchasing power relatively constant.

Yet President Bush says this is too much. He says that minimum wage workers should accept continued reductions in the value of their wages. For many minimum wage workers and their families accepting a smaller increase will mean less food on the table. It will mean an increase in the number of working Americans who are homeless.

We Democrats believe that the poorest American workers should not have the value of their wages reduced any further. These workers have already made enough sacrifices. In the name of fairness for American workers I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and I urge President Bush not to veto this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2. There is a saying that "justice delayed is justice denied." How true this is. It has been 8 long years since the last increase in the minimum wage was put into effect. Since that time the cost of living has risen more than 30 percent. As a consequence, in today's dollars, the current minimum wage is worth only \$2.56.

The case for increasing the minimum wage is urgent and compelling. Our opponents would have us believe that it should not be raised because most people who earn it are teenagers. However, the facts are that only about one-fourth are teenagers. Two-thirds of the minimum wage workers are women, nearly 7 million are full-time workers and nearly 4 million are heads of households.

Millions of Americans throughout this country have been driven into low-paying service jobs due to plant closing and layoffs. The low minimum wage drags down these workers and their families, as well as the wages of all other workers. The fundamental premise of raising the minimum wage is that it should be a living wage. No one who works for a living should be condemned to live in poverty.

Increasing the minimum wage to a livable wage will be one of the most important legislative goals for the 101st Congress. Basic human rights and economic survival are at stake. Economic justice must no longer be delayed or denied.

A minimum wage increase will put a few extra dollars in the hands of low-income workers; reduce Government expenditures for public assistance; restore a measure of dignity to low-wage workers; begin to approach a wage level that represents a fair day's pay for

a fair day's work; and generate more business because low-wage workers must spend virtually all of their income on basic necessities.

Inflation and delay have so eroded the traditional relationship of the minimum wage to average hourly earnings, that one would have to go back to the 1950's to witness the huge disparity of today. This situation is not acceptable; it must be changed.

I would have preferred a much stronger bill that increased the minimum wage to a higher level. In that sense, the conference report does not go far enough. It provides a modest increase. Nevertheless, I urge all of my colleagues in the House who care about protecting and enhancing the quality of life of the American people to vote for this report, and I urge the President to sign it without delay.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2 because it is fair and it is long overdue. Today I ask my colleagues to look ahead. Look ahead to an issue which we have rarely had to face in our history. The issue of labor shortages. Today, in the context of this debate, we have a chance to address this issue before it becomes a crisis, a chance to act instead of react.

A report by the Department of Labor on the impending shortages reveals that many in the labor force lack basic skills. Potential employees are found lacking in spelling, writing, mathematics, initiative, attitudes, and work habits. The pool of laborers in the best position to fill this critical void are today struggling and failing to stay afloat earning \$3.35 an hour. Could a wage earner possibly be inspired to make a real effort for a wage that yields no more than a welfare payment? Would this parent encourage his child to stay in school or would he allow that child to take a minimum wage job? At today's wage that parent would have no choice and the skills gap in the labor force will materialize as a crisis. I urge my colleagues to take a quick look back and see that increases in the minimum wage have been effective. More importantly I urge you to take a long look forward and see how costly the failure of this measure will be.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those who are arguing for economic justice for the working poor people of America—the more than 75 million people working in jobs subject to the minimum wage and the 7 million who are actually receiving it. Each week, the least paid of these workers take home less than \$150 after 40 hours of work.

I believe the previous speakers have already made the financial case to raise the minimum wage to \$4.65 an hour by 1992—isn't it enough that the lowest paid among us haven't been voted an increase by this body since 1977? I strongly agree with those arguments, but the dollars and cents facts are only part of the issue.

The bigger issue for me—and for millions of our fellow citizens watching this debate—is fairness.

To put it another way, how many of us could support our family on \$150 a week—even with a husband or wife working? Let's not kid ourselves, the majority of those 7 million minimum wage earners I mentioned are either women with children or heads of house-

holds. That means, in many cases, that that pittance of a paycheck is feeding, clothing, and housing three or more people.

How many of us could manage on that? How much longer can we ask millions of working Americans to do that?

To those who argue that increasing the minimum wage will cause a loss of jobs to the economy, I point to other evidence from the Department of Labor that debunks such contentions. In fact, I would argue that increasing the minimum wage will be a dramatic incentive to some of the most dispirited elements in our society and thus serve to increase the overall vitality of the economy.

To those who argue that paying the neediest workers a little more will cost the country resources that are more desperately needed elsewhere, I disagree. How can we argue on one day to pledge \$50 billion to bail out our failing banking institutions, and on the next deny a \$1.20 bailout for failing families?

The fact is that we cannot afford to act other than positively on this matter on behalf of our working poor. At risk is our credibility before the majority of working Americans, some of whom already question our commitment to their priorities.

To anyone who would argue that Congress has a higher priority than increasing the minimum wage, I would ask, what priority is higher than fairness?

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989. An increase in the minimum wage is long overdue. It is a matter of economic justice and human dignity. Clearly, it ought to be approved without further delay.

The fair labor standards amendment was established in 1938 to guarantee a living wage to the working people of this country. Since then, it has been periodically raised to compensate for inflation. However, the last time Congress increased the minimum wage was in 1977. At that time, it was raised in steps from \$2.30 to \$2.65 per hour in 1978, and to \$3.35 per hour in 1981.

The minimum wage has stayed at \$3.35 since 1981 and today its real value has decreased by more than 30 percent. It is no longer a living wage. In fact, the earnings of a full-time minimum wage worker supporting a 3-person family are 29 percent below the official poverty line.

Contrary to popular myth, the vast majority of minimum wage workers are not teenagers earning a little extra spending money. Approximately 70 percent of all minimum wage workers in 1986 were 20 years or older.

Despite President Bush's promise for a kinder, gentler nation, the administration is firmly opposed to H.R. 2. The President pledges to veto any increase that boosts the wage above \$4.25. A wage set at that level would not even come close to replacing the purchasing power lost by minimum wage earners since 1981.

The House-Senate conference report is the best alternative. It raises the wage over 3 years from its current \$3.35 an hour to \$4.55 and it allows employers to pay first-time workers a training wage during their first 2 months on the job.

While the conference agreement provides reasonable minimum wages for workers, it also assures reasonable opportunity for growth of small businesses by exempting those companies with less than \$500,000 in annual gross volume.

In conclusion, inflation and political delay have so eroded the traditional relationship of the minimum wage to average hourly earnings, that we would have to go back to the 1950's to witness the huge disparity of today. This situation is simply not acceptable; it must be remedied.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today for the conference report on H.R. 2, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989. I would like to begin by commending both the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Chairman HAWKINS, and the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Standards, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], for all the hard work they have put into this legislation. It has been a long, arduous process, with strong opposing views expressed along the way. In crafting both the original version of H.R. 2 and this conference report, the committee leadership did an excellent job of producing an equitable bill, taking into account the concerns expressed by all.

The Bush administration, on the other hand, has not budged an inch from its original proposal. The President continues to insist on a minimum wage level of only \$4.25 per hour, in addition to a 6-month training wage of \$3.35 an hour for all new hires. The compromise before us today is very reasonable and will certainly go a long way toward improving the quality of life for American workers while taking into account concerns expressed by the business community: The wage rate will be set at \$4.55 an hour after 3 years, businesses with less than \$500,000 in annual gross volume are exempt, the tip credit will be increased to 50 percent, and employers will be allowed to pay an eligible worker a training wage for a maximum of 60 days while the employee is engaged in on-the-job training.

We in this country agreed decades ago that the American worker deserved and needed protection against unfairly low wages, and, in fact, that we could determine a minimum wage below which no citizen of this country should work. We made a moral commitment to our workers that even those holding the most menial of jobs were entitled to a wage on which they could exist with dignity. By approving this conference report before us today, we will live up to this commitment. It will then be up to the President to decide whether or not he will live up to his campaign pledged of a kinder, gentler nation for all American citizens.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, let's tell the working men and women of America that we care about their future and that their lives matter.

Let's agree to bring them up to a decent, livable, working wage so they can participate in the American dream.

We're not talking about second homes and overseas vacations. We're talking about people being able to look at their kids in the eye and say "Yes, you can go to college."

If you want to leave behind the people who want to work and succeed, then vote no.

If you want to keep people on the borderline of poverty, forever dependent on Federal, State, and local aid programs, then vote no.

But if you, like me, want to improve the quality of life for minimum wage earners in this country, then vote yes on this minimum wage increase.

It's time for action. Millions of single parents, young people entering the work force, and the working poor are waiting to see if we care enough about them to do the right thing.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the fair labor standards amendment which will come before the House today. This measure will increase for the first time in nearly a decade the minimum level which employers can pay their workers, from \$3.35 an hour to \$4.55 by 1992.

Once enacted, the fair labor standards amendment will provide immediate relief for the estimated 2.1 million Americans who work full-time for the minimum wage, yet remain impoverished. The minimum wage traditionally has equaled 50 percent of the average hourly earnings; however, inflation has so eroded the value of the minimum wage that it has now slipped to less than 35 percent of the average hourly earning—an all-time low.

While I intend to vote to approve the conference report on H.R. 2, Mr. Speaker, I do so with some reservations. In the 100th Congress, my colleagues will recall, the House was considering legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$5.05 an hour within 4 years—a substantially higher wage level than the measure before us today. It is disappointing that we have conceded so much in only a few months. I also object to the subminimum training wage provision. I feel this wage invites abuse by employers seeking to get around the minimum wage law. In conclusion, this measure only goes part of the way toward ensuring a fair wage for all workers.

In the interest of compromise, however, I will support the conference report. The conference report on H.R. 2, in its current form, represents a major concession by Congress bringing the bill very close to the proposal put forth by President Bush. It is unfortunate that the President feels compelled to take a hard line on this issue, and intends to veto the measure. It is my sincere hope that Mr. Bush will come to agree with Congress that this conference report, while not perfect, is far better than no minimum wage legislation at all.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, which would increase the minimum wage to \$4.55 over the next 3 years.

For President Reagan once said, "When it comes to the bottom line, all of us are striving for the same thing—a strong and healthy America and a fair shake for the working people."

Unfortunately, some of the working people of this country aren't getting a fair shake. Nearly 5½ million Americans make a mere \$3.35 an hour—the minimum wage for the last 8 years—and are still below the poverty level.

Since the last increase in 1981, prices have risen 39 percent. After adjusting for inflation, the purchasing power of the minimum-wage

earner is lower than it's been in more than 30 years.

There are those who argue that only teenagers and part-time workers work at the minimum wage. But we know that 84 percent of those workers at the minimum wage are 18 years of age or older, and almost one-half of those earning \$3.35 an hour are working full time.

The original purpose of the minimum wage was to provide a living wage—at least a wage that allowed the American family to meet the necessities of life.

From 1959, the first year poverty statistics were collected, through 1981, a full-time, year-round minimum-wage worker earned 102.5 percent of the poverty level for a three-person household.

Today, a minimum-wage worker working full time earns \$6,968 per year. Seven in ten of those minimum-wage workers are their family's only earner. They support their family on roughly \$580 a month. That's 26 percent or nearly \$2,500 below the three-person poverty level.

More than 25 percent of minimum-wage jobs are held by heads of households. During the 1970's, almost 60 percent of young men earned enough to support a three-person family above the poverty level. By 1985, just 44 percent of young men were able to do so.

Today, two-thirds of the 600,000 women who solely support their families and work at the minimum wage are in poverty. That number increases to three-quarters when the woman is black.

Today's outdated minimum wage is no longer a livable one, and it has created a rise in the numbers of working poor and working homeless.

The problem isn't a lack of jobs, but rather that those minimum-wage jobs don't pay enough for a person or a family to eat and afford housing at the same time.

During the 1980's, the number of working poor rose 47 percent. In 1987, the Census Bureau found that 8.4 million Americans worked for a living, but lived in poverty. Of those, almost one-fourth worked full-time, year-round.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors estimated that last year 22 percent of homeless people held full-time or part-time jobs. A count of residents in Connecticut shelters found that 20 percent were working full-time.

I hope that President Bush realizes that we have tried to go at least halfway by accepting a lower minimum base than originally considered as well as a 60-day training wage. He must compromise as well. And he must recognize the value of what we are doing. I hope that he does not veto H.R. 2.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the conference report on H.R. 2 because what's good for the American workers is good for America.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, today is a dark day for agriculture, not because of drought, floods, or a bust in commodity markets, but because of a monster called H.R. 2, the Unfair Labor Standards Act. The burden that will be placed on the backs of a select group of people who clothe and feed the greatest Nation in the world is unbelievable.

Within this job destroying piece of legislation, is a farce provision called a training wage. The present proposal denies the farmers and ranchers of America the same right provided every other employer in the Nation, the right to a training wage. Although the training wage provision is basically ineffective, the stewards of the land will not be offered this wage rate. Granted, many farmers and ranchers will be exempt from payment of the Federal minimum wage, but over 25 percent will feel the wrath of the Unfair Labor Standards Act.

Even if the training wage provision was changed to include farm workers, it would not offset the damage that would be caused by this bill. In addition to increasing the annual inflation rate, H.R. 2 would cause a loss in job opportunities, force layoffs, and increase the overall cost of consumer products. Although there is some merit to a training wage, this bill does not provide a workable training program. I will continue to oppose any legislation that reduces the number of opportunities for employment and works to the detriment of the disadvantaged.

Although my support of this bill does not hinge on the inclusion of farm workers in the training wage, I am hopeful that the veto message from the President on this bill will include language stating that farm employers should not be discriminated against.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill not only because it will raise the unemployment rate, force families into poverty, raise consumer prices, but also because it is discriminatory to the men and women who toil over the land for our great Nation.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2, the Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1989.

Unemployment in our country is just over 5 percent, the lowest it has been in 15 years. But leave it to Congress to try and stop the current economic expansion by mandating a wage increase to \$4.55 an hour. An increase of this magnitude will destroy thousands of job opportunities for the young, the low-skilled, and the disadvantaged. In addition, raising the minimum wage will adversely affect small businesses, which create 70 percent of all new jobs.

H.R. 2 will also result in higher inflation and interest rates. The direct cost to consumers will be over \$12 billion. There will also be an impact on the Federal budget to the tune of \$2 billion. Indirectly, we could expect to see the Federal budget increase another \$5 billion through higher interest costs and higher benefits costs on programs. With a budget deficit of at least \$147 billion, we don't need to be looking for ways to further increase the deficit, nor do we have the resources to pay for such an increase.

A workable alternative to the minimum wage does exist. The Family Living Wage Act shares an identical goal with that of increasing the Federal minimum wage. It would provide direct financial assistance to workers at the bottom rung of the income ladder and it would accomplish that goal without a harmful effect on the American economy.

Unfortunately, this sensible solution has not been considered by the Congress.

Vote "no" on this conference report and let's give the Family Living Wage Act the serious and thoughtful consideration that it deserves.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—390

Akaka	Dicks	Hochbrueckner
Alexander	Dixon	Holloway
Anderson	Donnelly	Hopkins
Andrews	Dorgan (ND)	Horton
Annunzio	Dorman (CA)	Houghton
Applegate	Douglas	Hoyer
Armey	Downey	Hubbard
Atkins	Dreier	Huckaby
AuCoin	Duncan	Hughes
Baker	Durbin	Hunter
Ballenger	Dwyer	Hutto
Barton	Dymally	Hyde
Bates	Dyson	Inhofe
Bellenson	Early	Ireland
Bennett	Eckart	Jacobs
Bentley	Edwards (CA)	James
Bereuter	Emerson	Jenkins
Berman	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Bevill	English	Johnson (SD)
Bilirakis	Erdreich	Johnston
Billey	Evans	Jones (GA)
Boehlert	Fascell	Jones (NC)
Boggs	Fawell	Jontz
Bonior	Feighan	Kanjorski
Borski	Fields	Kaptur
Bosco	Fish	Kasich
Boucher	Flake	Kastenmeier
Boxer	Flippo	Kennedy
Brennan	Florio	Kennelly
Brooks	Foglietta	Kildee
Broomfield	Ford (MI)	Klecza
Browder	Frenzel	Kolbe
Brown (CO)	Gallely	Kolter
Bruce	Gallo	Kostmayer
Bryant	Garcia	Kyl
Buechner	Gaydos	LaFalce
Bunning	Gejdenson	Lagomarsino
Burton	Gekas	Lancaster
Bustamante	Gibbons	Lantos
Byron	Gillmor	Laughlin
Callahan	Gilman	Leach (IA)
Campbell (CA)	Gingrich	Leath (TX)
Campbell (CO)	Glickman	Lehman (FL)
Cardin	Gonzalez	Leland
Carper	Goodling	Lent
Carr	Gordon	Levin (MI)
Chandler	Goss	Levine (CA)
Clarke	Gradison	Lewis (CA)
Clay	Grandy	Lewis (FL)
Clement	Grant	Lewis (GA)
Clinger	Gray	Lightfoot
Coble	Green	Lipinski
Coelho	Guarini	Livingston
Coleman (MO)	Gunderson	Lloyd
Coleman (TX)	Hall (OH)	Long
Collins	Hall (TX)	Lowery (CA)
Combest	Hamilton	Lowe (NY)
Conte	Hammerschmidt	Lukens, Thomas
Conyers	Hancock	Lukens, Donald
Cooper	Hansen	Machtley
Costello	Harris	Madigan
Coughlin	Hastert	Markey
Cox	Hatcher	Marlenee
Coyne	Hawkins	Martin (IL)
Craig	Hayes (IL)	Martin (NY)
Crane	Hayes (LA)	Martinez
Dannemeyer	Hefley	Matsui
Darden	Hefner	Mavroules
Davis	Henry	Mazzoli
DeFazio	Herger	McCloskey
Dellums	Hertel	McCollum
Derrick	Hiler	McCrery
DeWine	Hoagland	McCurdy

McDade	Quillen	Smith, Robert
McDermott	Rahall	(OR)
McEwen	Ravenel	Snowe
McGrath	Ray	Solarz
McHugh	Regula	Solomon
McMillan (NC)	Rhodes	Spence
McMillen (MD)	Richardson	Spratt
McNulty	Ridge	Staggers
Meyers	Rinaldo	Stallings
Mfume	Ritter	Stangeland
Michel	Roberts	Stearns
Miller (CA)	Robinson	Stenholm
Miller (OH)	Roe	Studds
Miller (WA)	Rogers	Stump
Mineta	Rohrabacher	Sundquist
Moakley	Rose	Swift
Mollohan	Rostenkowski	Synar
Moody	Roth	Tallon
Morella	Roukema	Tanner
Morrison (CT)	Rowland (CT)	Tauke
Morrison (WA)	Rowland (GA)	Tauzin
Mrazek	Sabo	Thomas (CA)
Murphy	Saiki	Thomas (GA)
Murtha	Sangmeister	Torres
Myers	Sarpallus	Torricelli
Nagle	Savage	Towns
Natcher	Sawyer	Trafiacant
Neal (MA)	Saxton	Traxler
Neal (NC)	Schaefer	Unsoeld
Nielson	Schiff	Upton
Oaker	Schneider	Valentine
Oberstar	Schroeder	Vander Jagt
Obey	Schuetz	Vento
Olin	Schulze	Visclosky
Ortiz	Schumer	Volkmer
Owens (NY)	Sensenbrenner	Vucanovich
Owens (UT)	Sharp	Walgren
Oxley	Shaw	Walker
Packard	Shays	Walsh
Pallone	Shumway	Watkins
Panetta	Shuster	Waxman
Parker	Sikorski	Weber
Pashayan	Sisisky	Weiss
Patterson	Skaggs	Weldon
Paxon	Skeen	Wheat
Payne (NJ)	Slatery	Whittaker
Payne (VA)	Slaughter (NY)	Whitten
Pease	Slaughter (VA)	Williams
Pelosi	Smith (FL)	Wilson
Penny	Smith (IA)	Wolf
Perkins	Smith (MS)	Wolpe
Petri	Smith (NE)	Wyden
Pickett	Smith (NJ)	Wyllie
Pickle	Smith (TX)	Yates
Porter	Smith (VT)	Yatron
Poshard	Smith, Denny	Young (AK)
Price	(OR)	Young (FL)
Pursell	Smith, Robert	
	(NH)	

□ 1250

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 390 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2, FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENT OF 1989

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2. I do so reluctantly, as I agree that there must be an increase in the minimum wage. Members on the other side of the aisle have eloquently pointed out that the purchasing power of minimum wage has slipped significantly over the last decade.

The debate over this bill, however, has less to do with fair labor, decent wages, and inflation than it does with partisan political battles between Members of this body and the resident of the large house 16 blocks from here. It is another example of political symbolism triumphing over substantive action.

The President has supported an increase in the minimum wage. He did so during his campaign for that office, and renewed the pledge with his compromise proposal, one that would have increased the wage to \$4.25 over 3 years. His proposal is an earnest and acceptable offer. It is a proposal that seeks to insulate small businesses from the impact of a sudden jump in the minimum wage by the initiation of a realistic training wage. It is a proposal that never had a chance.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on this bill has made several things very clear. It is clear that the Democrats do not have enough votes to override a presidential veto. It is also clear that the President does not have enough votes in Congress to pass his own minimum wage plan. Why, then, are we continuing with this charade?

Let us begin again. Let us remember that both the administration and the Congress have gone on record in support of a minimum wage increase. Let us negotiate a reasonable compromise that meets the needs of both workers and businesses. Let us take meaningful action that will result in legislative success. Let us remember that an increase in the minimum wage is important because it will help the American worker, not because it helps Congress in its power struggle against the President.

Let us stop treating the debate over the minimum wage as a vehicle for political posturing. It is a game that is of no benefit to the American worker, and we should not play it.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, when I was in the State legislature for 2 years we fibrillated, unable to vote for an increase in the minimum wage, so the public grows up, put that measure on the ballot through the initiative and it was overwhelmingly approved by 76 percent of the public.

I call on my colleagues, Mr. President, to follow our public and let us overwhelmingly approve this increase to the minimum wage.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the minimum wage bill.

What we consider today is a matter of the most elemental fairness. It goes to the very heart of what this country of ours is all about. Today we seek to provide fairness for the working poor of this country. There are at least 4 million of them who receive no more than the minimum wage. That minimum wage has not been increased since 1981.

During that period of time, their buying power has been reduced by some 30 percent. In 1981, a woman working on a minimum wage and trying to support two children on her own, with the work of 3 hours of pay could purchase a \$10 sack of groceries. Today her 3 hours of pay will buy only a \$7 sack of groceries.

These are not people who have political power. They are not people whose names appear on the donors' lists to political candidates. They are not prominent in society—for the most part—but they work, and they pay taxes and they contribute mightily to this economy of ours. They do the work that most other people do not want to do.

They are the people who look to us to represent them. They have nobody else to represent them. They are not organized. If they were organized workers, they would be paid much more than the minimum wage, but they are not.

They are not people who seek a handout. They are not asking for welfare, although some of them are homeless because the wages they receive are not adequate to pay for homes or to pay rent in the society in which we live today. And yet they work. They want to perform the dignity of work. It seems to me it is to those people that America owes a very great deal, because without the work that they perform the wheels of American commerce would grind to a halt.

Now let us just look at it from the standpoint of elemental fairness. Let us consider what has happened in these intervening 8 years since 1981. Since that time the minimum wage has fallen to its lowest historical level. Originally when it was established, the idea was that the minimum wage ought to be about half the average wage. But today it has fallen to only about 35 percent of the average wage.

What has happened to others in our society during those same 8 years? I want to show you in a very simple comparative way the difference between what has happened to the highest position in American government and what has happened to them.

Let us take, for example, the post of the Vice President. The Vice President's pay has been increased and would have been increased by recommendations made by the President by \$40 an hour since 1981. There you have 400 dimes representing what would have happened to the Vice President's pay. Now I'm not saying it is not warranted. No doubt it is warranted. But that is what has happened in those years. That is an hourly increase of \$40.

What has happened to the take-home keep-home income of the top 1 percent of the American people as the result of tax cuts that we have voted since 1981? As a result of the tax cuts

that Congress has voted, let alone any other income that may have come to them, the average person in the top 1 percent of the income brackets in the United States will be allowed to keep \$17.40 every hour more. Calculated on a 40-hour week, that is about \$36,000 a year more in income that the top 1 percent has enjoyed as the result of tax cuts that we have voted. So there you have that comparative figure. That is hourly, that many more dimes an hour, 174 dimes.

Then if you were to add to that what is proposed by President Bush by way of a cut in the capital gains rate, the top 1 percent of America's income group would receive, on average, about \$30,000 more a year, or 144 dimes, or \$14.40 an hour more take-home pay. So there is what would be given by the Congress over this period of time in just tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent.

What then have we given to those at the bottom of our economic pyramid? Nothing, nothing at all. You see, they have lost.

Now what we propose to give is a very meager catch-up which will not even catch up to the buying power of the 1981 minimum wage by 1991.

The difference between what we propose and what President Bush says he would be willing to accept is three dimes. That is it. Three thin dimes.

Now, it is a question of elemental fairness in a country such as ours where we believe all work is dignified work, where we believe that those who do work ought to be protected—the basic American ethic, the fundamental idea that anybody who works for a living in the United States full time ought not to be poor, ought not to be needy, ought not to be homeless. If we believe these things, then surely we would be able to vote for this meager increase.

I hope that when we send it to President Bush he will reconsider it in light of the kinder, gentler admonitions that he has made. If this is to be a kinder and gentler country, certainly then those who work for a living ought to be able to have enough money, a day's pay, so that they will be able to afford hospitalization for their kids if the kids get sick, be able to have a roof over their heads, be able to have an adequate diet, and be able to have enough money to send those kids to school.

□ 1300

Those are the fundamental, elemental things, and this is fundamental, elemental fairness.

The gentlewoman from Washington State mentioned a moment ago a statewide vote in which 70 percent of those in her State voted for an increase in the minimum wage. If the polls I have read are to be believed,

some 84 percent of the people nationwide favor this legislation.

Please, bear in mind, my friends, that these are people who have nobody else to look after their interests. They do not have any lobbies. They are not represented by someone who comes and uses the blandishments and wiles of his persuasion to tell us that we ought to do something for them. They do not make contributions to political campaigns. They are the very people for whom we are elected, because we are the only voice they have.

Without us, they would be voiceless. We are the only source of power that they have. Without us and our concern for them, they would be powerless in this political democracy of ours, and I do not think we want to perpetuate that kind of a situation.

In a sense of fairness, a sense of justice, and a sense of what is just simply right, I ask the Members to vote for this bill and send the message to President Bush to consider it carefully and to sign the bill once we have sent it to him.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989 to raise the minimum wage sounds virtuous and laudable. It very well may be, but let us not fool ourselves into thinking that we are lifting the working poor out of poverty with an increase to \$4.55. Raising the minimum wage is not an antipoverty weapon.

A large majority of minimum wage earners are young part-time workers. Ninety-three percent of those earning minimum wage do not maintain families. Of the 3.9 million on minimum wage, one-third work in restaurants where many of their incomes are supplemented by tips. Sixteen percent of minimum wage earners work in sales where many of these earn commissions, yet they are still counted as minimum wage workers.

We say we're trying to help the working poor while we actually will be helping young part-time workers. There is one thing, however, upon which there is agreement. Economists from all persuasions agree that increasing the minimum wage will mean lost jobs and it will mean inflation. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 125,000 to 250,000 jobs will be lost; the Department of Labor's estimates range from 400,000 to 800,000. Of course, the first employees to suffer this reduction in jobs will be those that have the fewest skills and have the most to lose. We also know that increasing the minimum wage at this time will have a ripple effect on consumer prices. The last time we increased the minimum wage, from 1978 to 1981, inflation jumped from 7 percent to 12 percent and the prime rate more than doubled from 8 percent to over 20 percent. Inflation and recession are the cruelest taxes that we can levy on our working poor.

What is the best way to truly help the poor? First of all, the use of the earned income tax credit would allow us to target our efforts to those who are truly needy. Second, the creation of new jobs, a strong economy, and con-

tinued growth are components of the best employee-benefit program. During the last 7 years, there have been 19 million new jobs created. Sixty-three percent of our adults are now employed; this is a record. Let's keep this ball rolling and avoid any Government-imposed roadblocks. Instead, Congress must reduce its profligate overspending. The national debt now stands at \$2.8 trillion, and we pay \$240 billion a year in interest alone. Often overlooked, the Federal Government is also borrowing \$140 billion a year from the Nation's trust funds. Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on the conference report of H.R. 2, and let's put our energy into efforts that will truly help the poor.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989.

I commend the members of the Education and Labor Committee for moving so quickly with this important bill from the subcommittee to the full committee and through conference.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the President has not seen fit to support this important bill. The President has stated that he will veto this conference agreement if it is sent to him because the minimum wage will be raised 30 cents an hour more than he wants. H.R. 2 will increase the minimum wage from the current \$3.35 an hour to \$4.55 an hour over a 3-year period. The \$4.55 an hour wage rate would begin October 1, 1991.

It is very unfortunate that an important bill such as H.R. 2 may be vetoed because of a 30-cents-an-hour difference with the President. H.R. 2 is a bill that will help millions of working people who are trying to make a better life for their families by working full time and yet continue to remain in poverty. I cannot believe that vetoing this bill will lead to a kinder and gentler nation that the President has said he wants to see. To the contrary, such action will be extremely brutal to the millions of families that can hardly survive on the current minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, there has not been an increase in the Federal minimum wage since 1981, over 8 years ago. We must now act on behalf of the hard-working men and women of America to increase the minimum wage to a decent level. These workers deserve to be treated fairly.

I hope my colleagues will agree and support the conference report on H.R. 2.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOAKLEY). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 172, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—247

Akaka	Gonzalez	Obey
Alexander	Gordon	Olin
Anderson	Gray	Ortiz
Andrews	Guarini	Owens (NY)
Annunzio	Hall (OH)	Owens (UT)
Anthony	Hamilton	Pallone
Applegate	Harris	Panetta
Aspin	Hatcher	Pashayan
Atkins	Hawkins	Payne (NJ)
AuCoin	Hayes (IL)	Pease
Bates	Hayes (LA)	Pelosi
Bellenson	Hefner	Perkins
Bennett	Hertel	Pickett
Bentley	Hoagland	Pickle
Berman	Hochbrueckner	Poshard
Bevill	Horton	Price
Bilbray	Hoyer	Rahall
Boehlert	Hubbard	Rangel
Boggs	Hughes	Richardson
Bonior	Jacobs	Ridge
Borski	Jenkins	Rinaldo
Bosco	Johnson (CT)	Robinson
Boucher	Johnson (SD)	Roe
Boxer	Johnston	Rose
Brennan	Jones (GA)	Rostenkowski
Browder	Jones (NC)	Rowland (CT)
Brown (CA)	Jontz	Russo
Bruce	Kanjorski	Sabo
Bryant	Kaptur	Sangmeister
Cardin	Kastenmeier	Savage
Carper	Kennedy	Sawyer
Carr	Kennelly	Scheuer
Clarke	Kildee	Schneider
Clay	Klecicka	Schroeder
Clement	Kolter	Schumer
Coelho	Kostmayer	Sharp
Coleman (TX)	LaFalce	Shays
Collins	Lantos	Sikorski
Conte	Leach (IA)	Sisisky
Conyers	Lehman (CA)	Skaggs
Costello	Lehman (FL)	Skelton
Coyne	Leland	Slattery
Crockett	Levin (MI)	Slaughter (NY)
Darden	Levine (CA)	Smith (FL)
Davis	Lewis (GA)	Smith (IA)
de la Garza	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Lloyd	Smith (VT)
Dellums	Long	Solarz
Dicks	Lowe (NY)	Staggers
Dingell	Luken, Thomas	Stallings
Dixon	Machtley	Stark
Donnelly	Manton	Stokes
Dorgan (ND)	Markey	Studds
Downey	Martin (IL)	Swift
Durbin	Martinez	Synar
Dwyer	Matsui	Tallon
Dymally	Mavroules	Tanner
Dyson	McCloskey	Torres
Early	McCurdy	Torricelli
Eckart	McDade	Towns
Edwards (CA)	McDermott	Trafigant
Engel	McHugh	Traxler
Erdreich	McMillen (MD)	Unsoeld
Espy	McNulty	Vento
Evans	Mfume	Visclosky
Fascell	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Feighan	Mineta	Walgren
Flake	Moakley	Walsh
Flippo	Mollohan	Watkins
Florio	Moody	Waxman
Foglietta	Morella	Weiss
Foley	Morrison (CT)	Wheat
Ford (MI)	Mrazek	Whitten
Ford (TN)	Murphy	Williams
Frank	Murtha	Wilson
Frost	Nagle	Wise
Garcia	Natcher	Wolpe
Gaydos	Neal (MA)	Wyden
Gejdenson	Neal (NC)	Yates
Gephardt	Nelson	Yatron
Gibbons	Nowak	Young (AK)
Gilman	Oakar	
Glickman	Oberstar	

NOES—172

Archer	Bilirakis	Byron
Armey	Billiey	Callahan
Baker	Broomfield	Campbell (CA)
Ballenger	Brown (CO)	Campbell (CO)
Bartlett	Buechner	Chandler
Barton	Bunning	Chapman
Bereuter	Burton	Clinger

Coble	James	Roth
Coleman (MO)	Kasich	Roukema
Combest	Kolbe	Rowland (GA)
Cooper	Kyl	Salki
Coughlin	Lagomarsino	Sarpaluis
Cox	Lancaster	Saxton
Craig	Laughlin	Schaefer
Crane	Leath (TX)	Schiff
Dannemeyer	Lent	Schuetz
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Schulze
Derrick	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
DeWine	Lightfoot	Shaw
Dorman (CA)	Livingston	Shumway
Douglas	Lowery (CA)	Shuster
Dreier	Lukens, Donald	Skeen
Duncan	Marlenee	Slaughter (VA)
Emerson	Martin (NY)	Smith (MS)
English	Mazzoli	Smith (NE)
Fawell	McCandless	Smith (TX)
Fields	McColum	Smith, Denny
Fish	McCrery	(OR)
Frenzel	McEwen	Smith, Robert
Gallegly	McGrath	(NH)
Gallo	McMillan (NC)	Smith, Robert
Gekas	Meyers	(OR)
Gillmor	Michel	Snowe
Gingrich	Miller (OH)	Solomon
Goodling	Miller (WA)	Spence
Goss	Montgomery	Spratt
Gradison	Morrison (WA)	Stangeland
Grandy	Myers	Stearns
Grant	Nielson	Stenholm
Green	Oxley	Stump
Gunderson	Packard	Sundquist
Hall (TX)	Parker	Tauke
Hammerschmidt	Parris	Tauzin
Hancock	Patterson	Thomas (CA)
Hansen	Paxon	Thomas (GA)
Hastert	Payne (VA)	Thomas (WY)
Hefley	Penny	Upton
Henry	Petri	Valentine
Herger	Porter	Vander Jagt
Hiler	Pursell	Vucanovich
Holloway	Quillen	Walker
Hopkins	Ravenel	Weber
Houghton	Ray	Weldon
Huckaby	Regula	Whittaker
Hunter	Rhodes	Wolf
Hutto	Ritter	Wylie
Hyde	Roberts	Young (FL)
Inhofe	Rogers	
Ireland	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Courter	Molinari
Barnard	Dickinson	Moorhead
Bateman	Edwards (OK)	Pepper
Brooks	Fazio	Roybal
Bustamante	Madigan	Udall

□ 1320

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Fazio for, with Mr. Barnard against.
Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Courter against.
Mr. Bustamante for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2 just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EMMETT SANDERS LOCK AND DAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2178) to designate lock and dam numbered 4 on the Arkansas River, Arkansas, as the "Emmett Sanders Lock and Dam" and ask for it immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not plan to object, and I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, for an explanation of his request.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2178 would designate lock and dam No. 4 on the Arkansas River, AR, as the "Emmett Sanders Lock and Dam." I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Mr. Sanders served as mayor of the city of Pine Bluff, AR, in the 1940's and the 1970's, and had been a member of the Arkansas Basin Association since its inception in the 1930's. He served as the Association president and as a member of the coordinating committee, working with the various States that banded together to seek authorization and funding of the Arkansas River Basin project. His interest in transforming the Arkansas River from a menace to an asset continued until his death on March 21, 1989. Mr. Sanders played a leading role in bringing about the completion of the Arkansas River waterway system in a timely manner, and he has been by the Chief of Engineers for his work by being awarded the highest civilian award of the Department of the Army.

I believe that it is a fitting and appropriate tribute to the work of Mr. Sanders to designate lock and dam No. 4 in his behalf and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of H.R. 2178. This bill, which I introduced last week, would rename lock and dam No. 4 on the Arkansas River after Mr. Emmett Sanders, formerly of Pine Bluff, AR.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of honoring our most distinguished leaders by renaming the public facilities which they have helped to erect in memory of their accomplishments. In my view, this measure of respect and gratitude is best bestowed in the twilight of ones years so that the recipient is able to fully appreciate the honor. Accordingly, I

have, in the past, offered legislation to rename a number of public facilities after senior public figures who have played an important role in the life of their community. Such is the case with Emmett Sanders.

Mr. Sanders was the former mayor of Pine Bluff, AR, who, through tireless effort, worked to tame the Arkansas River, bringing navigation and a measure of flood protection to the area. He was an outspoken and extremely effective advocate of water resources development and progress and his efforts were met with not only success but the appreciation of the citizens of Pine Bluff. It is for these reasons that I have advocated legislation in the two preceding Congresses to honor Mr. Sanders by renaming lock and dam No. 4 on the Arkansas River at Pine Bluff as the "Emmett Sanders Lock and Dam."

Unfortunately, Mr. Sanders passed away earlier this spring. His passing was noted with deep regret as evidenced by local newspaper accounts which I would like to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I only regret that we were unable to bestow this honor on Mr. Sanders while he was alive. With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

[From the Pine Bluff Commercial, Mar. 27, 1989]

EMMETT SANDERS: THE VISION BEHIND THE SERVICE

Behind his eye for economy, his business-like manner and bookkeeper's exactitude, Emmett Sanders was a visionary. His dreams for Pine Bluff were as vast as his habits were regular. It was with his vision that some of Pine Bluff's most dramatic advances began, and through his unremitting efforts that they became reality.

For four decades, as mayor and alderman and public servant in general, Mr. Sanders served and shaped his city. He came as close as anyone to embodying local government during those years, and it was Pine Bluff's good fortune that he did. The minimal pay afforded public servants back then could not have brought the attention and devotion he lavished on this town freely. Emmett Sanders was always more interested in Pine Bluff's advancement than in his own.

Of his many visions, surely the idea of an Arkansas River converted from menace to asset was his greatest. And it included a thriving Port of Pine Bluff, the finest in the state. No one but a visionary could have foreseen all that in 1927, when the 100-year-flood came rampaging over the levees on both side of the river, sending refugees to seek shelter on the Free Bridge or any other structure that remained unsubmerged.

Emmett Sanders never forget the sight; it drove him year after year. He was an early member and later president of the Arkansas Basin Association. That lobby worked to make the vision real decade after decade, trip to Washington after trip to Washington, conference and report after conference and report . . . until the mean, twisted, treacherous old Arkansas was made over into the Kerr-McClellan River Navigation System. Thanks to dreamers—and workers—

like Emmett Sanders, the Arkansas no longer disrupts but serves. It controls floods instead of bringing them. And Pine Bluff reaps the benefits every day.

Utterly reliable, Mr. Sanders was so absorbed in his duties and projects that he was just absent-minded enough to be endearing. A walker, he could be seen traversing the city regularly, looking at it up close as he went his way, noticing things.

Like any public servant, Mr. Sanders took his share of flak over the years but, unlike many, tolerated it with complete self-confidence, never yielding to the temptation to reply in kind. His devotion to his family, especially his two "girls," was as much part of him as his devotion to his city. If Mr. Emmett ever erred, it was never on the side of too small plans or too little ambition of his town and state.

As he grew older, Emmett Sanders' enthusiasm for various projects seemed to grow younger. He had a very American confidence in an ever expanding future, and it grew all the stronger with the years. He died last week at 89, but it should be noted that his vision of what this city would do never grew old.

[From the Pine Bluff News, Mar. 23, 1989]

'MR. EMMETT'

Pine Bluff lost one of its truly outstanding citizens this week with the death of Emmett Sanders.

"Mr. Emmett" was involved in so many of the major developments in Pine Bluff during the great growth periods of the community in the middle decades of this century, there is no way to fully credit his contributions to the progress and development of our city and county.

In his positions in city government and in industrial and river development groups, Mr. Sanders gave us the vision and leadership that was vital to the successful development of such things as our industrial parks, the outstanding port facility that has made Pine Bluff the major shipping port on the Arkansas River, our Civic Center and Convention Center, and practically anything else that has enhanced the life of the city in the past 40 years.

He had a vision of greatness for Pine Bluff and a great pride in its achievements. We can all have an equal pride in his life and his accomplishments for his community. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2178

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

Lock and dam numbered 4 on the Arkansas River, Arkansas, constructed as part of the project for navigation on the Arkansas River and tributaries, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Emmett Sanders Lock and Dam".

SEC. 2. LEGAL REFERENCE.

A reference in any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States to the lock and dam referred to in section 1 shall

hereafter be deemed to be a reference to the "Emmett Sanders Lock and Dam".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2178, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], the program for next week?

Mr. FOLEY. If the distinguished Republican leader would yield to me, Mr. Speaker, this concludes the business for today and for this week. The House will not be in session tomorrow. The House will meet at noon on Monday next but there will be no legislative business.

The House will meet at noon on Tuesday and will consider 5 bills under suspension of the rules. We will withhold recorded votes that may be ordered on these suspensions until debate is concluded on all suspensions. But the suspensions, if they draw votes, will have those votes taken on Tuesday. They will not be postponed beyond Tuesday.

The suspensions are:

H.R. 968, Noise Reduction Reimbursement Act of 1989;

H.R. 838, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the Peninsula Airport Commission for airport purposes;

H.R. 2214, to ratify certain agreements relating to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations;

H. Con. Res. 63, to commend the 30th anniversary of the Tibetan national uprising and to express the concern of Congress regarding human rights abuses in Tibet; and

H.R. 2145, to prohibit U.S. contributions to the United Nations if full membership as a state is granted to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood.

Also Members should be advised of a possible resolution with regard to Panama which may be considered on Tuesday.

On Wednesday the House would normally, under the rules, meet at 10 o'clock, but I intend to offer a unanimous consent request that that be at 12 o'clock on Wednesday.

At 10 o'clock on Thursday to consider a conference report on the House Concurrent Resolution 106, the first concurrent resolution on the budget, subject to a rule; and H.R. 2072, the dire emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1989, subject to a rule, and H.R. 643, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act relating to oil shale claims, subject to a rule.

On Friday, May 19, 1989, the House will not be in session.

Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished Republican leader would yield further, I would like to remind Members that on May 15 the House will change the schedule, under standing orders of the House, and will meet regularly at noon on Monday and Tuesday and at 10 a.m., rather than 2 p.m. on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

Next week because of the pending Republican conference we will ask unanimous consent to meet at noon rather than at 10 a.m. on Wednesday. But the general rule will be 10 a.m. on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday and noon on Monday and Tuesday.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 15, 1989

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so just to ask one question if I may, and I will not object. On the resolution that may come up on Panama, would that come up under suspension of the rules?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it may come up under suspension of the rules or by unanimous consent. I cannot advise the gentleman at this time.

Mr. WALKER. I think the question on our side is, if it will come up under a procedure, will it be subject to an amendment?

Mr. FOLEY. I would advise the gentleman that I doubt very much it would come up on Tuesday in that form.

If it comes up on Tuesday it would be either under unanimous consent or under suspension. I do not think the Rules Committee would have an op-

portunity to consider a rule prior to Tuesday.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 1989

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, May 16, 1989 it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, May 17, 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND IN MADISON COUNTY, IL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2119) to authorize the exchange of certain Federal public land in Madison County, IL, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under my reservation I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, to explain his request.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2119 would authorize the United States to convey its interest in a parcel of land to the Blue Tee Corp. in exchange for the conveyance to the United States of the corporation's interest in another parcel of land.

The land owned by the United States was acquired in connection with the construction of the Melvin Price Locks and Dam project on the Mississippi River at Alton, IL. The land will

be under water when the pool behind the locks and dam is raised. This is expected to happen this September.

Local interests wish to develop a boating dock and marina in the area, and have determined that the land scheduled to be inundated would be the best location for the boating facilities if its elevation is raised by the placement of fill material.

The land owned by the United States was acquired in 1985 at a cost of \$137,350. In 1988 the United States acquired a flowage easement over the land owned by the Blue Tee Corp. for the sum of \$1.125 million. The remaining interest in the land held by the corporation, which would be conveyed to the United States, is valued at \$200,000.

Mr. Speaker, the interests in the lands to be exchanged are of comparable value—if anything, the value of the land to be acquired by the Government is likely higher considering the lower 1985 market value of the land presently owned by the Government.

Enactment of this legislation at an early date is necessary so that the land to be used for boating facilities can be raised prior to its inundation. I urge enactment of the bill.

□ 1330

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his explanation.

Let me commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COSTELLO] for his hard work in developing a solution to a problem that seems to work out well for all concerned. This solution will allow an important business concern to relocate to a more desirable location. It will allow the city of Alton, IL to develop some valuable recreational facilities. And it will ensure that work on the Melvin Price Lock on the Mississippi River proceeds on schedule without any impairment of the Government's interest. It is my understanding the value of the lands in question is approximately equivalent and that enactment of the legislation will not result in any costs to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, and ranking member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], I thank the Members for their support of this bill, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the land swap agreement that will be decided through this legislation will be of great benefit to an economic development project in my congressional district. This is an opportunity for the Federal Government to assist local government in an economic develop-

ment project at no cost to the taxpayers or to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I thank both of the gentlemen for their assistance.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

HR. 2119

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCHANGE OF FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND.

(a) EXCHANGE OF LAND.—Subject to section 2, at such time as the Blue Tee Corporation transfers all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in subsection (b)(1) to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary shall transfer all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in subsection (b)(2) to the Blue Tee Corporation.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—35.03 acres of land located in Madison County, Illinois, known as Government Tract Number 121 and owned by the Blue Tee Corporation.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—58.64 acres situated in Madison County, Illinois, known as Government Tract Number 122 and administered by the United States Army Corp of Engineers, which is constructing the Melvin Price Lock and Dam Project on this land.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS OF EXCHANGE.

The exchange of land authorized by section 1 shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) DEEDS.—

(A) FEDERAL LAND.—The instrument of conveyance used to convey the land described in section 1(b)(2) to the Blue Tee Corporation shall contain such reservations, terms, and conditions as the Secretary of the Army considers necessary to allow the United States to construct, operate, and maintain the Melvin Price Lock on that land.

(B) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The conveyance of the land described in section 1(b)(1) to the Secretary of the Army shall be by a warranty deed acceptable to the Secretary.

(2) REMOVAL OF IMPROVEMENTS.—The Blue Tee Corporation may reserve the right to remove any improvements on the land described in section 1(b)(1) belonging to them. The terms of such reservation shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Army. The Blue Tee Corporation shall hold the United States harmless from liability, and the United States shall not incur any cost, associated with the removal or relocation of such improvements.

(3) TIME LIMIT FOR EXCHANGE.—The land exchange authorized by section 1(a) must be completed within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The Secretary shall provide the legal description of the lands described in section 1(b). The legal description shall be used in the instruments of conveyance of such lands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 2119, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ROBERT DOUGLAS WILLIS HYDROPOWER PROJECT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 923) to redesignate the Federal hydropower generating facilities located at Dam B on the Neches River at Town Bluff, TX, as the "Robert Douglas Willis Hydropower Project."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me just state that we have carefully reviewed the bill on our side of the aisle. We will have no objections to its passage.

Mr. Speaker, for many years, Mr. Willis was the general manager of the Sam Rayburn Municipal Power Authority. That authority served as the local sponsor for the hydroelectric facilities at the Town Bluff project, facilities which were constructed using 100 percent local financing.

It is a fitting tribute to Mr. Willis' efforts that a component of the project, more specifically Dam B on the Neches River, which will provide power to the surrounding area should be named after him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the bill H.R. 923, which would redesignate the Federal hydropower generating facilities located at Dam B on the Neches River at Town Bluff, TX, as the "Robert Douglas Willis Hydropower Project."

Mr. Willis was connected prominently with public power and civic activities in east Texas for the majority of his adult life. Mr. Willis served as the executive director of the Sam Rayburn Municipal Power Authority from its creation in May 1980, until his death on May 14, 1988. During that time his public service has led to the

development of reliable power supplies for the involved communities of east Texas. The renaming of these hydropower generating facilities has the support of the Sam Rayburn Municipal Power Authority, the Sam Rayburn Dam Electric Cooperative, the Sam Houston Electric Cooperative, and the Southwest Power Administration of the Department of Energy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 923

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION. 1. REDESIGNATION OF HYDROPOWER FACILITIES.

The Federal hydropower generating facilities located at Dam B on the Neches River at Town Bluff, Texas, is redesignated as the "Robert Douglas Willis Hydropower Project".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, rule, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the Federal hydropower generating facilities located at Dam B on the Neches River at Town Bluff, Texas, shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Robert Douglas Willis Hydropower Project".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 923 the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME AND MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 49

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 49.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

SOLOMON URGES PRESIDENT BUSH TO ABROGATE PANAMA CANAL TREATY

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend

his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took the floor of the House to let you, the Congress, and the American people know of a resolution I introduced urging President Bush to abrogate the Panama Canal Treaty.

The recent events connected with General Noriega's attempts to steal the election just held in Panama underline the urgency of this matter. Until such time as a properly elected, democratic government assumes legal control of the nation of Panama, the strategically located canal cannot be allowed to be threatened by the likes of General Noriega. Nor can we stand by and let this killer endanger the lives of American men and women stationed in the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial I wrote over a year ago concerning this whole issue. In writing this editorial, I wanted not just to point out the dangers posed by General Noriega's presence in Panama, but to the fact that international law provides the basis for abrogation of treaties—such as the one now governing the canal, when certain unexpressed understandings connected with their negotiation prove to be false, and I am submitting the article for today's RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for forceful action by our Government, backed by the unanimous consent of the Congress. It is not a time for backpeddling and hesitation. The world is watching and so is this killer, Noriega.

[From the Albany (NY) Times Mirror]

BUSH SHOULD LIMIT CANAL PACT

(By Gerald B. Solomon and Bruce Fein)

Shortly before he left office, President Reagan urged the reconsideration of the 1977 Panama Canal treaty because of the unreliability of Panamanian leader Manuel A. Noriega.

During his confirmation hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary of State James A. Baker III also expressed misgivings about the treaty.

One of the President Bush's first acts should be to declare the portion of the treaty transferring sovereignty to Panama to be provisionally inoperative. Congress should also play a constructive role in acting on these concerns.

Noriega mocks the transfer's presumption of continuing Panamanian good faith and ability to prevent sabotage of the canal, and to safeguard its openness and security. International law would thus justify Bush's suspension declaration.

In 1903 the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty granted the United States perpetual use of and sovereignty over a 10-mile-wide, 50-mile-long Panama Canal Zone. Under U.S. sovereignty, the canal has operated reliably, and without sabotage or interruption. It has significantly boosted the commerce and national security of the United States.

During the Cuban missile crisis, 18 American warships transited the canal overnight, jumping ahead of commercial shipping to fortify a naval quarantine of Cuba. The U.S. warships would otherwise have consumed 13 days to navigate around Cape Horn.

Considering Panama's history of violence, chronic political turbulence and anti-Yankee sentiments, it is little wonder that the 1977 treaty considers good will and friendly relations as being indispensable to carrying out the treaty's terms. Since its birth, Panama has had four constitutions. During World War II, pro-fascist President Arnulfo Arias denied the United States defensive rights outside the Canal Zone. In 1964 Panamanian students rioted in the Canal Zone, leaving four American soldiers dead and dozens wounded while the Panamanian police and national guard stood aloof.

During the 1977 treaty negotiations, participants from both Panama and the United States openly acknowledged a basic presumption of good faith and political will behind the treaty terms. For instance, Panamanian negotiator Carlos Lopez Guevara trumpeted: "The canal has no defense without the friendship of the Panamanian people"—a view echoed by the Pentagon and President Carter. Similarly, Panama's chief treaty adviser, Romulo Escobar, insisted: "I think we must begin from one major premise: That the United States and Panama are not enemies." American Ambassador William J. Jordan recognized that "(a)gainst a threat of sabotage to the waterway, by far the best defense was the good will and cooperation of the Panamanian people and their national guard."

But Noriega's domestic and foreign-policy gambits undermine that treaty assumption. He has thickened ties with Cuba, Libya and Colombian Marxist guerrillas, and harassed the 40,000 U.S. civilians and 12,000 U.S. troops in the zone. Indicted by the United States for complicity in drug trafficking and subject to a companion economic embargo, he exploits those actions domestically to bestir Panamanian ill will towards America.

The 1977 treaty terminates U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone in 1999. That stipulation, however, is limited by the higher treaty right of the United States to protect and defend the canal from armed attack "or other actions" that threaten its neutrality or security or the right of U.S. warships to transit the canal expeditiously in cases of emergency. The latter right requires maintaining U.S. troops in the zone whenever prevailing Panamanian conditions are inconsistent with good faith and Panama's capacity to honor its 1977 treaty obligations—circumstances that exist today.

International law empowers a treaty signatory to suspend provisions when a material unexpressed postulate of the negotiations proves to be false. Thus, during World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared a shipping convention suspended and inoperative because a continuation of peace was an essential premise of its provisions. Similarly, Bush should inform Noriega U.S. troops will remain in the zone and that zonal security will remain untransferred in 1999 unless the United States then concludes that Panama is both able and politically dedicated to preventing an interruption of canal operations or a violation of canal neutrality.

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE-SENATE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE AGREEMENT

(Mr. HAYES of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the minimum wage conference committee, I would like to express my support for the House-Senate minimum wage increase agreement, which will be considered on the floor later today. But, I would first like to thank my colleague, STENY HOYER, for convening these 1 minute speeches on this very important issue.

As a former trade unionist, I have strongly supported the need for an increase in the minimum wage since my election to this body. This Congress has waited too long to address the needs of working men and women. I supported the House-passed legislation, and now the conference agreement, because there is absolutely no question as to whether or not there is a need to increase the minimum wage.

As you are aware, the conference committee has approved the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989 which raises the wage floor from \$3.35 to \$3.85 on October 1, 1989, to \$4.25 a year later, and then to \$4.55 in the third year. The minimum wage legislation also allows employers to pay a training wage of 85 percent of the minimum wage for up to 60 days that would be a one-time training wage and could not be imposed on a worker with more than 60 days of total job experience.

The basis for the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was to provide a decent wage at which working people can care for themselves and provide for their families. We, in the U.S. Congress, have neglected to honor this Nation's 50-year contract with workers to pay a better decent minimum wage. This oversight must now be rectified.

Now that our conference committee, headed by Chairmen KENNEDY and HAWKINS, has convened and completed its work, President Bush is the only remaining obstacle to a minimum wage increase, giving America's working poor their first pay raise in more than 8 years.

The President has stated his intent to veto the congressional agreement since the measure goes beyond his minimum wage ceiling of \$4.25 an hour, with a 6-month training wage. I will continue to fight for an equitable minimum wage increase, regardless of this veto threat. While I reluctantly agreed to the training wage provisions in this legislation, I cannot in good conscience further compromise my beliefs and agree to a lower wage increase, which would keep hard working Americans in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long and ongoing battle for us to reach this point. It took a great effort to gain consensus on the minimum wage issue, and I strongly urge my colleagues to stand in support of this wage increase,

and the conference report to H.R. 2. We must all understand that we have to hold-the-line on this minimum wage raise, regardless of the President's veto threat. Keeping workers in poverty was clearly not the intent of the minimum wage ceiling, and we can no longer condone nor tolerate such occurrences.

IT'S TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the minimum wage. We have compromised long enough at the expense of the well-being of America's working men and women. Now is the time to act.

The 1980's could rightly be labeled the "lost decade" for the working poor. In the 8 years since the minimum wage was last increased, millions of American workers have suffered a serious decline in their living standard because of Federal inaction to ensure that the minimum wage kept pace with the cost of living. As we approach the 1990's, the evidence in favor of raising the minimum wage is overwhelming.

As everyone in this Chamber is well aware, the minimum wage of \$3.35 an hour is the same as it was in 1981. The 8 years since the last adjustment marks the longest period without an increase since the law was first enacted in 1938. Due to inflation, the purchasing power of that wage has actually declined more than 30 percent. In other words, had the minimum wage kept pace with inflation, it would now be approximately \$4.68 an hour.

The most compelling indicator of our need to act is the fact that the 5 million Americans who currently work full time for the minimum wage earn an income that keeps them below the poverty line. In fact, an individual working 40 hours per week at the minimum wage earns only \$134 a week, before taxes and Social Security are deducted.

In March, I joined my colleagues in voting for legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$4.55 over 3 years and to create a lower, training wage for employees who have never worked before. The bill represented a compromise over the original measure which would have raised the wage to \$4.65 and included no training wage. It is my great hope that this compromise will convince President Bush to withdraw his pledge to veto any minimum wage increase over \$4.25.

The arguments against the minimum wage are not new. Indeed, in the first congressional debate in 1938 on legislation to establish a minimum

wage of 40 cents an hour, a Michigan Congressman argued that the proposed wage was "ill timed * * * and is neither in the interest of labor nor the Nation as a whole * * * enactment of the legislation will further increase unemployment, not reduce it."

Like their predecessors, present day opponents of an increase in the minimum wage assert that it would cause more harm than good. They now further argue that an increase is not needed since the majority of minimum wage earners are teenagers hoping to earn extra money for discretionary spending on such luxury items as brand-name clothes and CD's. In reality, nearly 70 percent of minimum wage workers are over 20 years old, and more than 1 million are trying to support a family on the minimum wage alone. More than 60 percent of those earning the minimum wage are women.

In 1938, a Maine Congressman eloquently stated that:

If we are sincerely in favor of improving working conditions throughout the Nation, especially to help those who are underpaid and unorganized, it is time to meet the situation businesslike and unselfishly, with friends and foes, Republicans and Democrats, willing to forget and forgive, to give and take.

Over 50 years later, these words retain their exactitude. For, if we seriously address the dismal condition of our Nation's working poor, who are increasingly joining the ranks of the homeless, we must establish a minimum wage that will provide an adequate standard of living. To do less and to continue to make the issue of raising the minimum wage a test of political will is to perpetuate a condition of poverty for those who deserve much more for their efforts.

IN SUPPORT OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. President, do not veto the minimum wage bill. Do not appear in headlines saying, "Bush Vetoes Minimum Wage."

It is not going to say, "Bush Vetoes Bill That Is Different Between Republicans and Democrats."

Mr. President, we are talking about \$500 per year for an individual who is working poor. We are talking about 7 percent of that individual salary in 1 year.

Mr. President, we are talking about 30 cents an hour.

Both sides have come a long way.

I think those of us on the majority side have a tip credit. We have a protection for small businesses. We have a

training wage. I think this side has come a long way.

Mr. President, it is important that you assume that pledge of a kinder, gentler Nation, and not veto the minimum wage bill over 30 cents an hour.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider the conference report on the fair labor standards amendments. Like my colleagues, I am greatly concerned about the working poor of my State and of this Nation.

The erosion of the minimum wage has led to a dramatic increase in the numbers of working poor. Statistics bare my statement out: In 1979, 6.5 million Americans lived below the poverty level. In 1987, 8.4 million Americans worked for a living but lived in poverty. The decline in the purchasing power of today's minimum wage is directly related to the escalation in the number of working poor.

The minimum wage was last increased in 1981 to its present level of \$3.35. However, as a result of inflation, the purchasing power of minimum wage earners has declined over 20 percent. In other words, compared to 1981, the purchasing power of today's minimum wage is worth a mere \$2.40. I would like to point out that in this same period, we increased Social Security benefits by 45 percent. In fact, when we adjust the minimum wage for inflation, we find that it is at its lowest level in four decades.

My friends and colleagues, I fear that we have been negligent. I say this because our silence over the past 8 years, has contributed to the rise of a new underclass in America—the working poor and homeless. I would remind my colleagues that today's minimum wage worker must provide food, shelter, and clothing for his or her family on just \$7,000 a year.

In short, our failure to raise the minimum wage is having dire and dramatic consequences for millions of American workers and their families. We, in Congress, must right the wrong that we have committed. Moreover we are duty bound to help those who lack a political voice participate in the life and prosperity of the Nation by raising the minimum wage. In closing, I would hope that the President will remember his campaign promise of a kinder gentler nation.

"... A fair day's pay for a fair day's work."—FDR on recommending legislation to establish a minimum wage May 24, 1937.

On March 23, 1989, the House passed a minimum wage increase by a vote of 248 to 171. The Senate passed its version on April 12 by a vote of 62 to 37.

The House will pass a conference report this week and the Senate is expected to act soon.

This Democratic bill would raise the minimum wage from its present level of \$3.35 an hour to \$4.55 an hour over three years (\$3.85 on October 1 of this year; \$4.25 on October 1 of 1990; and \$4.55 on October 1 of 1991).

This bill also permits the payment of a sub-minimum "training wage" to certain employees for 60 days and expands the exemption from coverage of the minimum wage law for small businesses. Businesses with gross sales under \$500,000 and family owned and operated businesses are exempt. The only employees eligible for the sub-minimum wage would be those whose total work experience is less than 60 days who is

receiving "on-the-job" training for at least 30 days. This Democratic bill also contains other safeguards to ensure employers do not replace regular wage workers with sub-minimum wage workers.

The Bush Administration wants to pay a subminimum wage to all newly hired employees for six months, regardless of their past experience and training.

The Department of Labor's own calculations show that minimum wage jobs require, at most, 30 days of training, yet the President insists on 6 months. The reality is that Bush is trying to destroy the effectiveness of the minimum wage entirely by giving businesses a huge loophole allowing them to hire and fire low skilled workers as a routine business practice.

Today the minimum wage is \$735 (or 9.5 percent) below the estimated 1988 poverty level for a family of two, \$2,463 (or 26.1 percent) below the poverty level for a family of three, and \$5,123 (42.4 percent) below the poverty level for a family of four.

The Pennsylvania Legislature found that many of the homeless in that state have jobs but do not make enough money to afford housing.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors estimated that last year 22 percent of homeless people held full-time or part-time jobs. In some cities, like San Antonio, more than half the homeless have jobs.

In 1987, a Gallup Poll revealed that the American people supported raising the national minimum wage to \$4.65 in 1990 by a wide margin: 77 percent to 20 percent.

In 1988, a Gallup Poll revealed that the American people favored raising the national minimum wage to \$5.05 by 1992 by a margin of 76 percent to 20 percent.

In 1989, a Washington Post/ABC News poll found 84 percent of Americans believed minimum wage should be increased, while only 14 percent thought it should be kept at the current level; 21 percent of respondents believed that such an increase should be given the highest priority, and 38 percent believed it should receive a high priority.

President Bush has threatened to veto any bill that increases the minimum wage beyond \$4.25 per hour, or that fails to include a six-month training wage that could be paid to all newly hired employees, regardless of their past experience and training.

The Bush Administration sees no problem with hard working Americans taking home a paycheck of \$134 per week after putting in a 40-hour week.

Bush claims he agrees that an increase is needed, but he is arguing about a mere 30 cents a week. At the same time he supports massive tax cuts for the very wealthy in the form of a capital gains tax break.

In other words, Bush has taken his first firm stand of this Administration by reaffirming the Republican commitment to the rich to the disadvantage of average working Americans.

While most Americans were better off during the last decade, the lowest fifth fell further behind. Bush says, "too bad!"

Nothing in the President's proposal requires real training, its just a recipe for abuse, a huge wink at big business to avoid paying the minimum wage.

Senator Bob Graham: "when I look at the President's proposal, it is not six months; it is potentially forever because a person could stay on that training wage time after time after time."

The minimum wage was last increased in 1981, when it was raised to its present level

of \$3.35 per hour. Had the minimum wage kept pace with inflation, it would now stand at \$4.68 an hour.

While the minimum wage has remained frozen since January 1981, average hourly wages have risen 35.9 percent, and the cost of living has increased 39.8 percent.

The lack of change in the minimum wage during a period of rising prices has reduced the value of the current minimum wage to only \$2.40 (in January 1981 dollars). This is the lowest purchasing power of the minimum wage since 1955.

Relative to the average hourly wage of all private-sector production and non-supervisory workers, the minimum wage has fallen to its lowest level since 1949.

This scandalous neglect of hard-working Americans has contributed to the rise of a new underclass in American society—the working poor and the working homeless.

Working for a living and living in poverty are no longer mutually exclusive conditions in the U.S. More than 1.1 million families cannot escape from poverty even though one or more persons within the family work full-time and year-round.

In 1987, 8.4 million Americans worked for a living, but lived in poverty, according to the Census Bureau.

From 1959 (the year poverty statistics were first collected) through 1981, the minimum wage was true to its original purpose: it provided a living wage. During these years, a full-time, year-round minimum wage worker earned, on average, 102.5 of the poverty threshold for a three-person household. Today a full-time minimum wage earner, working 40 hours a week for 52 weeks, earns \$6,968 a year. The only type of "family" that keeps out of poverty is a single individual living alone.

From 1973 to 1987, the average cash income in constant after-inflation dollars dropped from \$5,507 in 1973 for the bottom one-fifth of Americans. At the same time the top fifth froze from \$60,299 to \$68,775. In other words the average income of the lowest fifth dropped nearly 11 percent while those at the top fifth enjoyed a rise of 24 percent.

Bush has made his only other firm stand since assuming the presidency, his crusade to cut taxes for the wealthy. He proposes cutting the capital gains tax (a tax paid only by the richest Americans) to 15 percent, while working Americans pay up to 28 or 33 percent of their wages to taxes. His argument is that it will stimulate investment and lead to greater revenues in the U.S. Treasury, but economists disagree.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates the proposal would cost the Treasury nearly \$25 billion in lost receipts over six years.

The President fights a 30-cent pay raise for working Americans in poverty, yet he proposes a capital gains tax cut to give the very wealthiest Americans a \$30,000 tax cut. That cut is four times larger than the total annual income of Americans who work at the minimum wage.

"We are told we cannot afford 30 cents more an hour for the poorest of Americans but we can afford \$30,000 for the wealthiest Americans." (Senator Majority Leader George J. Mitchell during Senate floor debate.)

A KINDER, GENTLER MINIMUM WAGE IS A LIVABLE MINIMUM WAGE

More than a decade ago, the U.S. Congress passed the 1977 amendments to the

Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). These amendments, through a series of step increases, raised the national minimum wage rate to \$3.35 per hour as of January 1, 1981. While the minimum wage has remained unchanged since January 1981, average hourly wages have risen 35.6 percent, and the cost of living has increased 39.8 percent.

The lack of change in the minimum wage during a period of rising prices has reduced the value of the current minimum wage to only \$2.40 (in January 1981 dollars). Had the minimum wage been adjusted over the past eight years to maintain its January 1981 value, it would have reached \$4.68 per hour as of February 1988. But, as it is: The purchasing power of the minimum wage has declined to its lowest level since 1955, and relative to the average hourly wage of all private-sector production and non-supervisory workers, the minimum wage has fallen to its lowest level since 1949.

Allowing the value of the minimum wage to fall so steadily and for so long has not made life any kinder or gentler for those Americans who work at minimum wage jobs. It seems, in fact, all but certain that the stagnant and, hence, deteriorating minimum wage rate of the 1980's has contributed to the rise of a new underclass in American society—the working poor and the working homeless.

Working for a living and living in poverty are no longer mutually exclusive conditions in the United States. The plethora of statistics in Table 1 shows that poverty does not necessarily result from a lack of work effort but often results from insufficient rewards for work. When more than 1.1 million families cannot escape from poverty even though one or more persons within the family work full-time and year-round, the adequacy of the wages paid must be questioned.

TABLE 1.—WORKING FOR A LIVING, BUT LIVING IN POVERTY

According to the latest Census Bureau data on poverty, in 1987: 8.4 million Americans worked for a living, but lived in poverty, 5.0 million Americans worked full-time, but remained in poverty, and 1.9 million Americans worked full-time, year-round, but remained in poverty.

Excluding those individuals who did not work in 1987, and generally would not have been expected to work, because they were ill or disabled, over the age of 65 and retired or between the ages of 15 and 21 and going to school; 56.4 percent of the individuals living in poverty worked during the year, 33.1 percent of the individuals living in poverty worked full-time, and 12.5 percent of the individuals living in poverty worked full-time and year-round.

With respect to the 7 million families mired in poverty in 1987: One or more persons worked full-time, year-round in 1 in 6 poor families, and one or more persons worked at least part-time, part-year in 57.2 percent of poor families.

Excluding those heads of households who did not work in 1987, and generally would not have been expected to work, because they were ill or disabled, retired, or single-parent mothers at home caring for children under the age of six: 70.7 percent of the householders worked during the year, 48.5 percent of the householders worked full-time, and 21.9 percent of the householders worked full-time and year-round.

Of those householders who worked part time: 52.4 percent were single-parent mothers with children under the age of 18, and

25.7 percent were single-parent mothers with children under the age of six.

The original purpose of the minimum wage was to provide a living wage—at least a wage that allowed the American family to meet the necessities of life. Upon proposing the legislation that established the national minimum wage rate, Senator Hugo Black explained:

"The bill is intended to prevent . . . the payment of wages which are below a necessary subsistence level. The bill is written upon the principle that the Congress should not attempt to make itself a wage fixing body. We believe that wages should be fixed by agreement between employer and employee, except that the bill has as its objective withdrawing from competitive conditions the wage level necessary for a person to live on, wherever he may be." (*Congressional Record*, June 27, 1937, p. 7651.)

From 1959 (the year that poverty statistics were first collected) through 1981, the minimum wage was true to its original purpose—it was a living wage. During those years, a full-time, year-round minimum wage worker earned, on average, 102.5 percent of the poverty threshold for a three-person household.

Today, however, the minimum wage no longer keeps a family above poverty. A full-time minimum wage earner, working 40 hours a week for 52 weeks, earns \$6,968 a year. The only type of "family" that the wage keeps out of poverty is a single individual living alone. For the other American families, the minimum wage is inadequate. This is seen by the fact that: it is \$735 (or 9.5 percent) below the estimated 1988 poverty level for a family of two, it is \$2,463 (or 26.1 percent) below the estimated 1988 poverty level for a family of three, and it is \$5,123 (or 42.4 percent) below the estimated 1988 poverty level for a family of four.

Without an increase in the minimum wage, the income gap for minimum wage workers will grow even wider in 1989. This year, for example, assuming inflation does not accelerate above last year's rate, a full-time minimum wage worker will earn approximately \$2,850 (or 29.0 percent) less than the projected poverty threshold for a family of three.

The link between the current minimum wage and poverty and homelessness has been repeatedly acknowledged by people directly involved in efforts to alleviate the plight of these unfortunate Americans. Their stories again demonstrate that the problem is often not the lack of jobs but that many jobs do not pay enough to enable a person or family to eat and afford housing at the same time.

The Pennsylvania legislature's Subcommittee on Health and Welfare found many of the homeless in that State have jobs but do not make enough money to afford housing. According to State Representative Michael Dawida: "What shocked the committee was when we went to Montgomery County, the wealthiest in the State, and found people sleeping on benches . . . There is almost no unemployment in that county, but many people can't afford the housing."

The U.S. Conference of Mayors, using information supplied by mayors' offices in 26 cities, estimated that last year 22 percent of homeless people held full-time or part-time jobs, up from 19 percent the year before. In some cities, like San Antonio, more than half the homeless have jobs.

David Christensen, executive director of the Harbor Interfaith Shelter, an agency that helps homeless families become self-

supporting, estimated that minimum wage workers must set aside 70 percent to 80 percent of income for housing. About 30 percent of the families who come to the shelter have at least one wage-earner, Christensen explained; "You have to be the tightest money manager in the world to spend 70 percent to 80 percent of your money on rent."

A count of residents in Connecticut shelters found that 20 percent were working full-time. "It's probably the first time in American history that homelessness is appearing among employed people," explained Robert Hayes, counsel for the National Coalition for the Homeless. "And it's on the upswing."

For those who have worked with, or studied, the problems of the working poor and homeless, a common response is to increase the minimum wage. The report of the Pennsylvania legislature's Subcommittee on Health and Welfare recommended increasing the minimum wage. As the counsel for the National Coalition for the Homeless points out, "the best place to begin" to deal with this social and economic calamity is "to increase the Federal minimum wage."

Opponents of legislation to raise the minimum wage attack this premise by arguing that minimum wage earners are mostly teenagers and other part-time workers whose earnings are not essential to their family's well-being. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce cites the following statistics in arguing against any increase in the minimum wage: Two-thirds of minimum wage-workers are part-time workers, 60 percent of minimum-wage workers are under 25 years of age, and most minimum wage workers are teenagers living in households with an employed adult.

While these statistics are technically correct, they are misleading in that they do not take into account those workers earning more than the current minimum wage but less than the proposed higher minimum wage. As shown in Table 2, for workers earning between the current minimum wage, \$3.35 an hour, and the higher minimum wage of \$4.65 an hour proposed by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee: Nearly half of these wage earners are full-time workers, more than 50 percent of these wage earners are over 25 years of age, and only 40 percent of these wage earners are children living in families.

For workers earning between \$4.25 an hour, the minimum wage level proposed by the Bush Administration, and \$4.65 an hour, the differences in the demographics are even greater. For these workers: More than 60 percent are full-time workers, nearly 60 percent are over 25 years of age, and only 30 percent are children living in families.

TABLE 2.—DEMOGRAPHICS OF LOW-WAGE WORKERS

	[In percent]		
	\$3.35	\$3.35 to \$4.64	\$4.26 to \$4.64
Full-time workers	32.1	47.0	62.6
Part-time workers	67.9	53.0	37.4
Children in families	51.7	40.8	30.6
Teenagers	39.7	29.3	18.6
Non-teenagers	60.3	70.7	81.4
Under 25 years of age	61.8	51.8	41.6
Over 25 years of age	38.2	48.2	58.4

The problem with the figures cited by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other opponents of an increase in the minimum wage is the confusion they create as to who would

benefit from such an increase. This confusion was evidenced by a recent New York Times editorial which incorrectly stated that "most of those who do benefit from increased wages will be part-time workers from middle-income families."

The argument that those who would benefit most from an increase in the minimum wage would be teenagers or others working part-time jobs to earn a little extra "spending money" is simply not true. For example, nearly 1 to 5 workers earning \$4.65 per hour or less are the only employed members of their family.

The contention that an increase in the minimum wage results in lost jobs is another age old myth that has always been cited by opponents of the minimum wage. So often has this contention been repeated that it, too, has become a common misconception cited as an ordinary fact. Last year, for example an editorial in the New York Times noted that raising the minimum wage would "push thousands of needy workers off the job rolls."

The employment effects of an increase in minimum wage, however, would not necessarily be evidenced by workers being thrown "off the job rolls." As University of Michigan Professor Charles Brown, former senior economist with the Minimum Wage Study Commission has noted, "The reduction in employment predicted in the standard model is not necessarily accomplished by that number (or any number) of workers being discharged since turnover rates in minimum wage jobs are on the order of 12.5 percent per month, attrition is a speedy method of adjustment."

Whatever employment affects occur following an increase in the minimum wage they are likely to take place in terms of fewer jobs being created rather than existing jobs being lost.

While opponents suggest that raising the minimum wage is courting economic disaster, history reveals that the minimum wage has been repeatedly raised in the past without resulting in any economic calamity. As Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz reported to Congress in 1966 "The record is that following the original establishment of the minimum wage there is clearly no evidence of decreased employment resulting from statutory minimum wage rate increase." Indeed as shown in Table 3, excluding those occasions when a change in the minimum wage has coincided with a severe recession, every increase in the minimum wage since 1950 has always been followed by a period of increased employment.

TABLE 3.—THE MINIMUM WAGE AND EMPLOYMENT

	Change in minimum wage	Change in employment ¹
January 1950	\$0.40 to \$0.75	+1,977,000
March 1955	\$0.75 to \$1.00	+962,000
September 1961	\$1.00 to \$1.15	+585,000
September 1963	\$1.15 to \$1.25	+1,282,000
February 1967	\$1.25 to \$1.40	+1,609,000
February 1968	\$1.40 to \$1.60	+2,066,000
May 1974	\$1.50 to \$2.00	+1,438,000
January 1975	\$2.00 to \$2.10	+1,634,000
January 1976	\$2.10 to \$2.30	+2,655,000
January 1978	\$2.30 to \$2.65	+3,585,000
January 1979	\$2.65 to \$2.90	+1,910,000
January 1980	\$2.90 to \$3.10	+28,000
January 1981	\$3.10 to \$3.35	-308,000

¹ Change in employment over the 12-month period following increase in minimum wage.

As mentioned previously, the idea that an increase in the minimum wage results in lost jobs comes from theoretical economic models that indicate some jobs may not be

created with such an increase. The precise number of jobs involved is very unclear. Critics of an increase have charged that it could involve hundreds of thousands, perhaps, millions of jobs.

In testimony to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee on March 3, 1989, the Administration asserted that an increase to \$4.65 would result in the loss of 650,000 jobs.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce puts the number of lost jobs even higher. It projects 750,000 lost jobs if the wage is increased to \$4.65.

A study by Clemson University economists estimated that an increase in the minimum wage to \$4.65 would cost 1.9 million jobs by 1995.

While economists generally agree that an increase in the minimum wage would have some impact on employment, there is no general agreement that the magnitude of the impact would be as large as that claimed by critics of minimum wage legislation. In contrast to the studies cited above, other credible studies indicate that the number of theoretical jobs not created will be minimal.

A study by an economist with the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Policy concluded that while "there are sound reasons to believe that increasing the minimum wage does reduce teenage employment, the evidence from the CPS time-series data is not very convincing."

The Minimum Wage Study Commission estimated that a 10 percent increase in minimum wage is associated with a reduction in teenage employment opportunities of about one percent.

A study at the University of Michigan under the supervision of the senior economists for the Minimum Wage Study Commission, found that a minimum wage increase of 10 percent is associated with a 0.56 percent decrease in employment opportunities and that there is no effect on the employment of young adults (age 20 to 24).

The bottom line is, as Professor Brown points out, the "effects of the minimum wage on employment are smaller" than supposed, and the economic impact of an increased minimum wage is "overrated."

COMPARISON BETWEEN MINIMUM WAGE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT AND BUSH PROPOSAL WAGE RATE

Under the conference agreements, the minimum wage rate would be increased to \$4.55 an hour by 1992;

Under the Bush proposal, the minimum wage rate would be adjusted to \$4.25 an hour by 1992.

TRAINING WAGE

Under the conference agreement, employers are authorized to pay inexperienced workers 85 percent of the minimum wage for a maximum of 60 days for on-the-job training—\$3.87 in 1992. Employees are eligible for the training wage until they have worked for a total of 60 days for all employers. Migrant and seasonal farm workers are exempt from the training wage.

Under the Bush proposal, employers could pay any new hire, regardless of prior work experience, 80 percent of the minimum wage for 6 months—\$3.40 in 1992. No training would be required. The Bush proposal would exclude virtually all migrant farmworkers from regular minimum wage coverage and would subject approximately 40 percent of all low-wage workers to a subminimum wage.

MINIMUM WAGE REVIEW BOARD

The conference agreement establishes a bipartisan review board to submit periodic recommendations to the Congress on adjustments needed to preserve the purchasing power of the minimum wage and estimates of the economic effects of enacting such adjustments.

The Bush proposal does not provide for an objective means to examine the minimum wage rate.

TIP CREDIT

Both the conference agreement and the Bush proposal provide for an increase in the tip credit from 40 percent to 50 percent.

SMALL BUSINESS EXEMPTION

Both the conference agreement and the Bush proposal increase the small business exemption to \$500,000. The conference agreement leaves current law's coverage for hospitals and schools unchanged; the Bush proposal would include hospitals and schools in the small business exemption.

OVERTIME EXEMPTION FOR REMEDIAL EDUCATION

The conference exemption would exempt employers from overtime provision up to a maximum of 10 hours per week while workers lacking a high school diploma receive remedial education; the Bush proposal has no comparable provision.

CONGRESSIONAL COVERAGE

The conference agreement would apply the rights and protections of the Fair Labor Standards Act to House and Senate employees; the Bush proposal has no comparable provision.

APPRECIATION TO PUBLIC SERVANT ALAN KRANOWITZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, you know a lot of people come and go in this great institution, a lot of staff people. Some to seek their fortune, others to do other things. It is pretty rare when we actually see someone stay for years and years and years. A true public servant.

One of those that just left our service, Alan Kranowitz, a very good friend, very good staff member here in this institution, one that gave up so many things to serve our great country. Alan is a longtime friend of mine. In fact, when I used to head Congressional Affairs at the Office of Management and Budget, Alan had held that job back in the seventies as well, and worked for our good friend and former colleague, Tom Loeffler, for a number of years. I really got to know him when he came down to the White House and served as head of the House side of Congressional Affairs for many years.

In that capacity, I witnessed many daily meetings, luncheons, working out on the steps of the House, lobbying Members to vote one way or another. He had a tremendous understanding of the issues and the issues

that run this institution. He knew the personalities, and that is how this institution works, the personalities. That is what really makes things go.

We on the Republican side of the aisle, we do not have the votes on most of the issues. In fact, today we had only 175 out of 435 votes and for those early days particularly in the Reagan administration when Ronald Reagan was acclaimed across this great land as having a tremendous relationship with Congress, the tremendous battles that he was able to win, working with Congress and working through the initiatives that the Reagan team was able to get through, so many of them were responsible because of the guiding hand of Alan Kranowitz, knowing the issues, knowing the personalities, being able to build the coalitions to get things done.

We gave up quite a bit, Alan did, sacrificing that to serve this great institution, both in the White House and again later in the House of Representatives.

□ 1340

Dick Cheney, now the Secretary of Defense, unopposed in our own leadership fight for minority whip this last year, and who probably became the fastest Member to get confirmed through the Senate once he was announced to become Secretary of Defense, worked closely with Alan Kranowitz. Alan Kranowitz had a great hand in Dick Cheney's success. Alan, for good reason, was going to be one of his top aides here on the House floor if Dick Cheney had stayed as whip.

When Alan announced his departure just 2 or 3 weeks ago, I know there was great sadness on my own side of the aisle, as well as on the Democratic side, knowing that we will miss a great friend, someone who has worked and toiled for countless hours, hundreds and hundreds of hours, for the cause.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us, in recognition of Alan Kranowitz' contributions to this great institution, wish him a great farewell, and I know that we will see him again soon.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAINT FRANCIS DE SALES CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Wise). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, it was nearly 100 years ago, on September 15, 1889, that Bishop Richard Phelan laid the cornerstone for a new church on the corner of First and Mary Streets in McKees Port, PA. It would be called Saint Francis de Sales Church.

That must have been a happy occasion—and a very special occasion—for all the clergy and laity who were gathered there that day.

But I am sure that none of them could have predicted that the next 100 years would see thousands of people at Saint Francis for worship, for counseling, for education, for solace. They could not have predicted the 9,385 baptisms, the 5,629 confirmations, the 2,863 weddings, the 3,084 deaths in the parish that they were starting.

The church building at First and Mary was the center of the parish until 1900, when the present church—which faces Chartiers Avenue at Margaret Street—was built.

From the start, an important part of the mission of Saint Francis de Sales was its school. Indeed, the building that was dedicated in 1889 had two floors, with the school on the first floor and the church on the second.

Excellence in education was always a hallmark of the Saint Francis de Sales School. That tradition continues to this day in McKees Rock Catholic School, which was formed 11 years ago when Saint Francis de Sales School merged with the parish schools of Saint Cyril and Methodius; Saint Mary, Help of Christians; and Saint Vincent de Paul.

A big part of the reason for the success of Saint Francis de Sales through the years has been the dedication and devotion of its pastors. Their names and the dates of their service are: Rev. Charles J. Coyne, 1889–1911; Rev. William Dunlea, 1911–1928; Very Rev. Philip J. Moore, 1929–1960; Rev. Michael A. Cusick, 1960–1966; Rev. John B. Maher, 1966–1969; Rev. William A. Lavelle, 1969–1972; Rev. Thomas M. Kirby, 1972–1985; and Rev. Richard J. Dorsch, 1985–present.

The motto of Saint de Sales was, "Ask for nothing, refuse nothing." The pastors, parishioners, and employees of his church have kept that standard for 100 years.

This is an appropriate time to mention two groups of unsung heroes and heroines. The first is the church's current staff and employees: Rev. Richard Dorsch, pastor; Father Regis Ryan; Delores Gallagher; Ellie Brown; Edward Shearer; Anna Grace Perrier; Deborah McGowan; Sister Michele Quinn; Ruth Dines; Margaret Flaherty; and Sarah Anderson. The second is Joe Colucci, chairman; Bill Arbanes; and all of their colleagues on the Centennial Committee who have given generously of their time, energy, and effort for 3 years now. Each of these individuals in their own special way deserves our praise and recognition for all their good work.

On May 21, Reverend Dorsch and his parishioners will commemorate the church's centenary with a mass, which will be celebrated by the bishop, and a banquet.

I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating them all and wishing them joy and happiness on that day.

LEGISLATION TO REFORM PROCEDURES IN SALE OF FARM PROPERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, I introduced H.R. 2113, a bill that I believe will help correct a situation that has arisen with the right of

first refusal provision and the selling of inventory property under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act as amended by the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987. The abuse I am referring to involves the former owners of their families or tenants of Farmers Home Administration [FmHA] inventory property who choose to exercise their right to purchase the farm property. It has come to my attention, however, that not surprisingly, in certain cases these former owners of farmers who chose to exercise this right did so for the prearranged purpose of selling it to an ineligible person.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the original intent of Congress with regard to the FmHA offering the former owner or tenant the first opportunity to buy such property. I certainly have no objection to giving such farmers a chance to purchase this property if they are truly interested in the continued operation of the farm. The provision allowing the FmHA to offer inventory land to other eligible borrowers was also a positive although imperfectly crafted component of the Agricultural Credit Act. However, there provisions were imperfectly crafted by the amendment process and invited abuse. The disturbing reports of abuses in Nebraska and other States occurring with these sales are serious, and changes in procedures must be made.

A particularly troubling case for example, involved a tenant who chose to exercise his option to purchase FmHA land at the appraised value for the prearranged purpose of reselling it to an ineligible party. The ineligible party who supplied financing for the original FmHA sale then sold or traded the land to wealthy ineligible person for a profit. This is clearly not the intended result of the law that Congress passed.

In addition, I know, for example, that under current FmHA procedures for selling inventory property, persons who are not truly eligible to purchase this land are in effect, becoming eligible by improper methods. The current procedures for the disposition of inventory property require that the potential purchaser must be an eligible FmHA borrower who cannot obtain financing from a private bank. In turn, the county FmHA committee is then mandated by law to select an applicant who has the greatest need for farm income and best meets the criteria for eligibility.

However, it has been brought to my attention that literally dozens of farmers who wish to be considered for eligibility for the FmHA inventory property have asked their local banker to turn them down for a loan in order to meet FmHA eligibility criteria. It seems to me that we have presented

the county committees with the almost impossible task of selecting one eligible applicant out of many who claim to be eligible and are legitimately eligible.

It is my intention to correct these situations through the introduction of H.R. 2113. First, the bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use a deed restriction or covenant to restrict the tenant or other eligible persons who wish to purchase inventory property from transferring or selling this property for no less than 2 years. The bill would also remove the county committee from what is often the nearly impossible task of deciding which applicant has the greatest need as defined by law or regulations. Instead, the county committee would be able to use a random selection process to select a buyer from eligible persons.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill would allow the sale of the inventory property to eligible persons based on the fair market value of the farmland rather than on its appraised value. The sale of inventory property at its fair market value will also help eliminate the abuses of third-party sales by insuring that inventory property is sold at a level comparable to private sales of other farmland.

LET US END THE FUSION CONFUSION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, over the last weeks, we have all been elated, inspired, and confounded by reports of the advent of "cold fusion."

Are we on the verge of a new era? An era without fossil fuel dependence, the greenhouse effect, dangerous radioactive waste, and implacable Persian Gulf political dilemmas. I sincerely hope so.

Yet, laboratories around the country have attempted to confirm the cold fusion claims, with little or no success. Recently, two prominent research centers, Cal Tech and MIT, have found significant errors in the original interpretation of the cold fusion experiments.

Were the original cold fusion claims overstated? I don't know. Indeed, it's remarkable how little is known about this phenomenon which has so inspired the American public.

And yet, some suggest that Congress divert funding from traditional fusion to cold fusion research. Clearly, Congress needs to get to the bottom of this controversy so that it can make informed decisions in its allocation of research moneys.

Today, my colleagues, Representatives BOXER, BATES, COLEMAN, DEFazio, SPRATT, and myself will introduce the following concurrent resolution. It recommends that the Department of Energy take immediate action to determine the validity of claims regarding recent cold fusion experiments. The resolution recommends that the Department provide a program to expedite the development of cold

fusion, if its promise as an alternative energy source can be confirmed. Otherwise, the resolution calls on the Department to outline a program to expedite the development of traditional fusion research.

The potential benefits of fusion power are widely known. It is time to cut through the confusion surrounding fusion research and establish a national program to expedite the development of this promising source of limitless, clean energy.

H. CON. RES. 120

Whereas fusion energy offers the potential of safe, clean power which is unlimited in amount, is free of long-lived, high-level radioactive waste, and can have environmental advantages over other technologies; Whereas budgetary constraints have forced the Department of Energy to cut back on fusion energy research programs;

Whereas the field of magnetic fusion research has a 30-year history of successful and mutually beneficial international cooperation;

Whereas the Office of Technology Assessment states in its recent report "Starpower: The U.S. and the International Quest for Fusion Energy" that the Department of Energy now sees more intensive international collaboration as a financial necessity;

Whereas the United States has been an active participant in international efforts to develop a conceptual design for a magnetic fusion reactor called the "International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor", with the costs shared by the participants;

Whereas the conceptual design phase of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor will conclude in the near future; and

Whereas failure to participate in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor project could place fusion research in the United States far behind such research in Japan, Europe, and the Soviet Union and could force the United States to rely on foreign technology to satisfy the Nation's future energy needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress strongly recommends that the Department of Energy continue to work closely with other nations in the field of magnetic fusion research, if such collaboration can take place without jeopardizing our national security interests or endangering our domestic fusion program; that the Department foster collaborative research in fusion materials to maximize the environmental advantages of fusion energy; and that the Department conduct, in an expeditious manner, a thorough analysis detailing the specific benefits, the existing obstacles, and the steps necessary to overcome such obstacles to participation in the engineering design phase of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor.

LUMBEE RECOGNITION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, more than 100 years ago the tribal leaders of Indians in southeastern North Carolina asked Congress to formally acknowledge their special heritage as native Americans. A year after the centennial of that first request, it is with great enthu-

siasm that I am introducing the "Lumbee Recognition Act," which will extend Federal recognition to the Lumbee Tribe of Cheraw Indians of North Carolina.

In December 1987 the Lumbee Indians filed a fully documented petition for Federal acknowledgement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This is the process which all tribes seeking recognition must now go through. In the case of the Lumbees, however, I feel it is necessary to circumvent the usual recognition process for several reasons. Foremost, I feel this legislation merely completes a process which Congress began in 1956 when it passed the Lumbee Act. As you may know, the 1950's marked a period when the Federal Government sought to end many of its trust relationships with native Americans. Although the 1956 legislation stopped short of formally acknowledging the Lumbees, it refers repeatedly to their heritage as Indians. None of the other tribes seeking recognition today can claim such a precedent. Furthermore, one other tribe with an almost identical legislative history, the Tiwa Tribe of Texas, was recognized through legislation during the Reagan administration.

Due to the backlog of pending petitions at BIA, the Lumbees have been told that their petition will not receive active consideration until 1993. This means a final ruling on the petition could be up to 10 years away. Such a timeframe makes it unlikely that tribal members whose expertise was so vital to the completion of the petition will be available for consultation when the BIA begins its consideration. Most importantly, I must keep in mind the interests of all the citizens of Robeson County, NC, where most of the Lumbee Indians reside. If the Lumbees were recognized under the BIA recognition process, they would be responsible for setting up their own criminal and civil justice system. Rather than risk undermining improving relations in this tri-racial community, I have included provisions to ensure that the State of North Carolina maintains its civil and criminal jurisdiction over this area.

In drafting this legislation, I have also kept in mind both budgetary restraints and the immediate needs of other federally recognized tribes. Included in the bill is a new funding mechanism, endorsed last year by Interior Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs Ross Swimmer, which would establish BIA funding for the Lumbees as a new line item, totally separate from BIA outlays for other federally recognized tribes. The 1989 Lumbee Recognition Act does not provide for any appropriations, and it would be several years before Congress could even consider such appropriations.

The guidelines established at BIA to federally recognize American Indians fail to take into account the special circumstances which apply the Lumbee Indians. Theirs is truly a unique case, and I call on my colleagues to support this effort to extend the Lumbee Indians that status they deserve as a federally recognized tribe.

THE RESPONSIBLE BUDGET

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the most significant legislation upon which I have voted since being elected to the U.S. Congress last year, was House Concurrent Resolution 106, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1990. The budget of the Government of the United States will deeply affect every American citizen and also many governments and individuals around the world.

I voted in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 106. I did so because it appeared that the failure of the Congress to pass this budget resolution, based upon the recent budget agreement between the administration and the bipartisan leaders of Congress would create a crisis in the budget making process. It appeared that the views of the Members of Congress are so diverse, that the entire budget process would be reduced to chaos, unless we enacted this budget.

Listening to the several alternative budgets proposed, anyone could see how they greatly differed from each other in terms of priorities and approaches, and understand that the chances of another agreement were very slim. I certainly did not want to see the budget process descend into chaos, particularly in the first few months of the administration of a new President. Even though I am a member of the President's political party, my desire for budget stability would be the same for a new President of the other party.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, although we avoided one crisis, we have created another crisis because this budget resolution, fails, once again, to come to terms with the budget deficit.

This budget resolution contains provisions such as:

First, an admitted increase in the budget deficit of \$9 billion over the administration's first proposal;

Second, limiting the admitted increase in the deficit to \$9 billion only because the resolution includes an agreement to produce about \$5 billion in revenues, without an agreement as to how to raise those revenues. This means that we may still have an impasse in Congress, which the bipartisan budget agreement was intended to avoid;

Third, meeting the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit target for fiscal year 1990 only by such devices as counting trust account income, most notably from Social Security taxes, for purposes of calculating the deficit, when this income was never intended to be either used or counted in terms of general budgetary expenses; by changing the payment date of some expenditures and taking others off

budget completely; and by basing the entire budget package upon the most optimistic predictions about economic performance during the next fiscal year, which may turn out to be unrealistic.

Mr. Speaker, the budget deficit is more than a theoretical exercise. In this fiscal year, interest on the accrued national debt accounts for nearly 15 percent of the entire Federal budget. We often debate the economic priority between military and domestic spending all around the fact that 15 percent of the budget goes to pay the interest on the national debt. These funds are not available for either military or domestic spending or for any other purpose. It is obvious that if this 15 percent of the budget were available for discretionary spending, the requests for both national defense and domestic programs, along with other requests for humanitarian assistance in other parts of the world, could be met. But, as we continue to permit the national debt to grow, we are increasing our interest payment obligations, which will only further reduce available money in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the next bipartisan accord for fiscal year 1991 will adequately and accurately address our budget deficit. But, if this does not happen for fiscal year 1991, that is, if a budget resolution is proposed which again fails to really address the deficit, then I intend to vote "no" and risk the budgetary chaos, because then the Congress will be compelled to confront the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the upcoming budget discussions for fiscal year 1991, the administration and the leaders of Congress will agree to produce a fiscally responsible budget and not continue to add to the debt and to the interest we must pay. Otherwise they risk a majority of the Members voting "no" which would allow crisis and chaos to force us to do our jobs.

□ 1350

THE NORTH AMERICAN WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT PLAN

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation with the Honorable WALTER B. JONES, the Honorable DON YOUNG, the Honorable ARLAN STANGELAND, the Honorable LINDSAY THOMAS, and the Honorable PORTER GOSS to further the implementation of the North American waterfowl management plan.

The average number of ducks in North America in recent years has been lower than any comparable period on record. The number of breeding ducks currently averages only a

little more than half the number present in the 1970's. The key factor in the alarming decline in our continent's waterfowl population is the continuing destruction of wetlands. In short, existing public and private wetland protection efforts have been inadequate.

The North American waterfowl management plan, signed in 1986 by the Minister of Environment for Canada and the Secretary of the Interior for the United States, outlines a far-reaching joint effort to identify the major management problems, establish objectives, and propose a series of strategies to protect waterfowl habitat, restore declining waterfowl populations, and enhance waterfowl research and management.

The plan extends to the year 2000 and will be implemented through action plans developed at the national, flyway, provincial, territorial, and State levels, which will then set out specific management details required for waterfowl conservation in both countries.

Successful rebuilding of waterfowl numbers will require the restoration, protection, and improvement of almost 6 million acres of habitat in six priority ranges in the United States and Canada. These areas are essential for the perpetuation of North American waterfowl and require immediate action. They are: Prairie potholes and park lands, lower Mississippi Valley, the gulf coast, California's Central Valley, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence lowlands, and the Atlantic coast.

The North American waterfowl plan when adopted in 1986, provided the framework addressing this habitat need; unfortunately the plan does not address funding.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that I have introduced today provides a commitment for that funding. It does so by providing a structure that encourages partnerships among public agencies and private interests to protect, enhance, restore, and manage habitats for migratory birds and other fish and wildlife in North America. While waterfowl are the most visible and well-known wildlife species that rely on wetlands, they aren't the only beneficiaries of the plan. Shorebirds, upland game birds, and even endangered species use wetlands. A myriad of mammals, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates, fish, and plants are a part of the wetlands. Saving wetlands for ducks also protects these areas for hundreds of other species.

In planning for the future of waterfowl, we must reflect upon the past, consider the present, and recognize and appreciate the tremendous efforts that have been made since the turn of the century on behalf of waterfowl conservation by many organizations. Millions of dollars have been expended to preserve and manage waterfowl habitat across the continent. The acquisitions made by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission have spearheaded the Federal effort into wetland conservation. State and local agencies along with Ducks Unlimited and the Nature Conservancy have lead the fight on the local level for wetland protection.

We have carefully drafted this legislation to avoid any conflict with the actions of the Migratory Bird Commission which have been so successful in addressing the Federal wetlands conservation needs. The gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] who are the Commissioners on behalf of the House of Representatives have provided an immense amount of guidance and support to those efforts and I look forward to working with them in further developing the concepts which are contained in the legislation, in order to make it, or some alternative, more efficient in furthering the goals of the plan.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, summarized at the end of this statement, starts us on the road to protecting the habitats needed to bring waterfowl populations back to the level that we once enjoyed. It's an important step in coordinating the cooperation and financial contributions of all interested parties, both public and private.

The key to the success of this undertaking will be the participation not only of the national governments of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, but also the involvement of State, provincial, territorial, and local governments, and private individuals, conservation organizations, and businesses.

SUMMARY OF THE NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION ACT

SELECTION AND FUNDING OF WETLANDS CONSERVATION PROJECTS IN THE UNITED STATES, CANADA, AND MEXICO

The Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to match federal funds with non-federal funds for wetland conservation projects (acquisition, management, enhancement or restoration of lands and waters administered for long-term conservation) in Canada, Mexico and the United States.

A nine-member North American Wetlands Conservation Commission is established to recommend wetlands conservation projects to the Secretary for federal funding under the Act. Acquisition by the Secretary of Lands and Waters under the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund, Land and Water Conservation Fund or other laws would not be subject to this process or otherwise affected by the Act.

The Commission consists of the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary to the Board of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and seven individuals appointed by the Secretary. Four of these individuals must live in different flyways and be directors of state fish and wildlife agencies directly responsible for conservation of fish, wildlife and wetlands. The other three must represent different charitable, non-profit organizations which are actively participating in implementation of the Plan.

The Commission's recommendations on funding of wetlands conservation projects are to be based on (1) the availability of sufficient non-federal monies to carry out any project; (2) the extent to which any project represents a partnership among public agencies and private entities; (3) the consistency of any project in the United States with the National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan developed under the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act; (4) the substantiality of the character and design of any project; (5) the extent to which any project fulfills the purposes of the Act and the goals of the Plan; and (6) the recommendations of any partnerships among public agencies and private entities in Canada, Mexico or the United States, which are participating actively in carrying out any projects under the Act of the Plan.

The Secretary in consultation with the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission is required to approve the federal funding available under the Act for wetlands conservation projects in the order of priority recommended by the Commission unless the Secretary finds that any of those projects should not have been recommended based on consideration of the factors listed above. If the Secretary makes such a finding, the Secretary is required to provide the Commission and Congress with a written justification.

CONDITIONS RELATING TO WETLANDS CONSERVATION PROJECTS

The Secretary may convey any lands and waters purchased with federal funds to a state or another entity approved by a state. Any lands and water acquired, enhanced, managed or restored with federal funds cannot be converted for uses other than conservation without the approval of the Secretary. If lands and waters purchased with federal funds are not conveyed, they must be included in the National Wildlife Refuge System.

The Secretary may provide federal funds to public agencies in Canada or Mexico or entities approved by these agencies to assist in carrying out approved wetlands conservation projects.

FUNDING OF WETLANDS CONSERVATION PROJECTS

Funds to carry out wetlands conservation projects are provided as follows:

1. The interest earned through short-term investment of any federal excise tax revenues in the Pittman-Robertson fund that are not needed to meet a current year's withdrawals would be available to the Secretary under the Act (about \$10 million annually). None of the fund's excise tax revenues (the fund's capital) would be allowed to be used by the Secretary. Thus, the Act would have no effect on the amount of the fund apportioned to any state or territory. Once the goals of the Plan are achieved, the interest earned each year from short-term investments would become available for apportionment to the states.

2. The penalties or fines, or funds from forfeitures or property under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Act (about \$1 million annually).

3. In addition to the amounts above, the Act authorizes appropriation of \$15 million annually to the Department of the Interior to carry out wetlands conservation projects.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Up to 70 percent, but not less than 50 percent, of each year's funds must be allocated by the Secretary to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects in Canada and Mexico. Up to 4 percent of this amount may be used for administering the Act. The federal money for projects in Canada or Mexico must be matched by at least 25 percent non-federal money. The non-federal share may not be derived from federal grant programs.

At least 30 percent, but not more than 50 percent, of each year's funds must be allocated by the Secretary to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects in the United States. The federal money to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects in the United States must be matched by at least 50 percent non-federal money. The federal share may be 100 percent if the project is conducted solely on federal lands and waters or involves the acquisition of inholdings within such lands

and waters. The non-federal share may not be derived from the federal grant programs.

REFUGE REVENUE SHARING

The Secretary is not allowed to acquire lands and waters for inclusion in the National Wildlife Refuge System with the funds under the Act unless full funding is provided under the Refuge Revenue Sharing Act for payments in lieu of taxes to counties with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service lands.

RESTORATION, PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF WETLANDS AND MIGRATORY BIRD HABITAT ON FEDERAL LANDS

Each federal agency responsible for acquiring, managing or disposing of federal lands and waters is required, consistent with the agency's mission, to cooperate with the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to restore, protect and enhance the wetland ecosystems and other waterfowl and migratory bird habitats within its lands and waters.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

The Secretary is required to report to Congress every two years with an assessment of the following:

(1) the estimated number of acres of wetlands and habitat for waterfowl and other migratory birds that were restored, protected or enhanced during such two-year period by federal, state and local agencies and private entities in the United States, Canada, and Mexico; and

(2) trends in the population size and distribution of North American migratory birds.

The Secretary also is required to report annually to Congress concerning the status of wetlands conservation projects, including an accounting of federal, state and private expenditures by Canadian and Mexican sources to carry out these projects.

REVISION TO THE PLAN

In 1991 and every five years thereafter, the Secretary is required, with the appropriate officials in Canada and Mexico, to revise the goals and other elements of the Plan in accordance with the information required above and with the other provisions of the Act.

ARTHUR C. GUYTON DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, an event will be held in Mississippi on August 25 honoring one of our State's most outstanding citizens. It will be called "Arthur C. Guyton Day" in recognition of the more than 40 years Dr. Guyton has served the University of Mississippi and our entire State.

Dr. Guyton has already been honored with resolutions passed by both Houses of the Mississippi Legislature and will be feted at a reception for 4,000 at the Mississippi Coliseum on August 24, prior to the special ceremonies the following day.

Dr. Guyton's work as a physician, author, scientist, teacher, husband and father is truly a great story. I want to share an article written about Dr. Guyton by Brenda Owen and printed in the Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal in Tupelo.

The article follows:

**ARTHUR C. GUYTON DAY—RENOVED
TEACHER, RESEARCHER TO BE HONORED**

(By Brenda Owen)

In 1946, when he was a 27-year-old surgical resident, Dr. Arthur C. Guyton was stricken with polio.

The disease left him partially paralyzed, and his dreams of becoming a cardiac surgeon were shattered. He could have used this disability as an excuse to quit trying. Instead, he used it as an opportunity.

Although polio had affected his mobility, it had not affected his ability to research, to write and to teach.

And so his career as a scientist, author and teacher began.

Today, Guyton, a native of Oxford, is chairman of the physiology and biophysics department at the University of Mississippi Medical Center in Jackson, a position he has held more than 40 years.

He is a world-renowned scientist whose discoveries have become basic to treatment of heart patients. He is the author of the most widely used physiology textbook in the world. And he is a teacher who has given more than 4,000 medical students the benefits of his knowledge.

The measure of appreciation for Guyton and his accomplishments has been shown by the designation of August 25th as Arthur C. Guyton Day in Mississippi.

Thousands of Guyton's colleagues, friends and former students will gather in Jackson to commemorate the event. Highlights of the day will be a medical symposium at the Municipal Auditorium in the afternoon and a gala banquet at the Trade Mart at the Fairgrounds in the evening.

Jack Stuart, chairman of the committee in charge of Arthur C. Guyton Day, said he expects no problems finding the 2,000 sponsors needed to contribute the \$200,000 tab for the event. To become a sponsor costs \$100, with the right to purchase one banquet ticket for \$15 and a second for \$25.

"As Dr. Guyton nears retirement, we thought it only fitting that the community come together to show its deep respect and gratitude for his many contributions," Stuart said.

Guyton, at age 70, will officially retire in September.

Unofficially, however, Guyton said in a recent interview, "I don't plan to slow down a step."

He said he will continue his research and his writing as long as he feels like has something to discover or something to say.

That could take a while since Guyton's life has always been one of challenge, courage and academic excellence. These traits were a family tradition.

Guyton's father, Dr. Billy Guyton, was dean of the medical school on the Oxford campus from 1936-1943. His mother has taught mathematics and physics as a missionary in China, and she encouraged her children in such studies.

Guyton did not disappoint them. He graduated from Ole Miss with special distinction in 1939 and went to medical school at Harvard. His post-graduate training in cardiac surgery at Massachusetts General Hospital was interrupted by service in the U.S. Navy.

He was assigned to secret physiological research projects at Camp Detrick, Maryland. His work there earned him an Army Commendation Citation.

The war over, he returned to Massachusetts General as a surgical resident. He was on his way to becoming a cardiac surgeon when he was stricken with polio.

During his nine-month recovery at Warm Springs, Ga., he pondered the plight of polio victims struggling with their useless limbs. He passed the time by trying to work out ways of helping them. By the time he had recuperated, he had invented a motorized wheelchair, a special hoist and a walking brace which freed thousands from the restraints of polio.

This work earned him a Presidential Citation.

Guyton returned to Oxford in 1947 to become associate professor of pharmacology in the School of Medicine, and a year later he accepted his present position as professor of physiology and chairman of the department. He played a leading role in establishing and planning the University of Mississippi Medical Center, which opened in Jackson in 1955.

During the years he taught in Oxford he wrote the textbook of Medical Physiology, which has become the most widely used physiology textbook in medical schools worldwide. It was published a year after he and the school of medicine moved to the new University of Mississippi Medical Center in Jackson, where the curriculum expanded to a four-year program. Since then he has written more than 500 publications, including several books and numerous articles.

His accomplishments will make him a hard act for the next chairman to follow.

During his tenure at UMMC, Guyton and his team have discovered some of the essential relationships between kidney function and blood pressure. He also has developed a computer mathematical model of the human body, containing more than 400 equations to make up the model's cardiovascular system alone.

These accomplishments are testimony to Guyton's genius as a scientist, but perhaps his most important personal contribution is the family he and his wife, Ruth, raised and inspired.

Of their 10 children, eight boys and two girls, nine are doctors, and the 10th—the youngest—will enter medical school this fall. Among them are eight Harvard graduates and five medical professors. They hold prestigious positions in hospitals and research centers in Maryland, Georgia, Texas, Washington, Massachusetts, Florida, Iowa and Mississippi.

Guyton said he and his wife did not intentionally pressure their children to enter the medical profession.

"I think the younger ones may have felt some pressure from the older ones, but I think they all enjoy their profession," Guyton said.

One legislator called the Guytons "Mississippi's most outstanding family."

Guyton said he appreciates having a day named in his honor, but he is modest about his long list of accomplishments, always crediting his department's help in his research discoveries.

"It's a team effort," he said, "and I'm just head of the team."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DICKINSON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHIFF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. UPTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHIFF) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. GILMAN in three instances.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. DOUGLAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KAPTUR.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. GAYDOS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. LEVINE of California in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

A BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On May 10, 1989:

H.R. 1385. An act to make permanent the Martin Luther King Jr., Federal Holiday Commission.

On May 11, 1989:

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning May 7, 1989, as "National Correctional Officers Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, May 15, 1989, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1169. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of individuals who filed DD Form 1787, report of DOD and defense related employment for fiscal year 1988, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2397(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1170. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting his views on the importance of the planned relocation of the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing from Spain to Italy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1171. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 14th annual report of the Corporation's Office of Consumer Affairs, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 57a(f)(6); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1172. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations—General Education Provisions Act—Enforcement, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1173. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a copy of the Eastern waters study report, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1727 nt.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1174. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting text of ILO convention No. 168 and recommendation No. 176 concerning employment promotion and protection against unemployment as adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 75th session, at Geneva, June 21, 1988, pursuant to article 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1175. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting text of ILO convention No. 167 and recommendation No. 175 concerning safety and health in construction as adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 75th session, at Geneva, June 20, 1988, pursuant to article 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1176. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Melvin F. Sembler, of Florida, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-designate to Australia, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1177. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Morris Dempson Busby, of Virginia, for the rank of ambassador as Coordinator for Counter Terrorism-designate, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1178. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the report of the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending March 31, 1989, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(d); jointly, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to prevent the loss of low-income housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. KENNEDY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.R. 2319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the effectiveness of the low-income housing credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 2320. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Nevada as wilderness, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. CARR (for himself, Mr. SABO, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. HENRY):

H.R. 2321. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to limit acquisitions of control of air carriers to ensure fitness; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DAVIS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. GOSS):

H.R. 2322. A bill to protect North American wetlands ecosystems and waterfowl and other migratory birds and fish and wildlife that depend upon such habitats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOEHLETT, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of Califor-

nia, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mrs. SAIKI):

H.R. 2323. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for the attainment of the national ambient air quality standards in areas which have failed to attain those standards, and to provide for maintenance of such standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS (by request):

H.R. 2324. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 1990 and 1991, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2325. A bill to establish a domestic liability and compensation system for oil pollution from vessels and facilities and to implement the 1984 protocols to the 1969 civil liability and 1971 fund conventions concerning seagoing tanker-source oil pollution; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Ways and Means.

H.R. 2326. A bill to transfer administration of bridges and causeways over navigable waters from the Secretary of Transportation to the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. SYNAR):

H.R. 2327. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration to provide grants under the rural health care transition grant program for transforming rural hospitals into medical assistance facilities; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 2328. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age, and to provide for an in-

crease in the exempt amount under the earnings test for beneficiaries who have not attained retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Vermont):

H.R. 2329. A bill to improve the operation of vocational education programs under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act by promoting accountability, making the act more flexible, reducing administrative burden, and fostering economic development and the improvement of vocational education personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2330. A bill to permit secondary mortgage market financing for residential properties that include small day care centers; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 2331. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to designate as nonmailable matter solicitations of donations which could reasonably be misconstrued as a bill, invoice, or statement of account due, solicitations for the purchase of products or services which are provided either free of charge or at a lower price by the Federal Government, and solicitations which are offered in terms implying any Federal Government connection or endorsement, unless such matter contains an appropriate conspicuous disclaimer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. GEJDESON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2332. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the District of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAXON (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York):

H.R. 2333. A bill to provide for the protection of the Genesee River in New York State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SARPALIS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 2334. A bill to redesignate the Post Office located at 300 East Ninth Street in Austin, TX, as the "Homer Thornberry Judicial Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 2335. A bill to provide Federal recognition for the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHULZE (for himself, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. HATCHER):

H.R. 2336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the bene-

fits of the special estate tax valuation of farmland where the land continues to be farmed for an extended period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2337. A bill to ensure that serving with honor is the aspiration of every employee in our Government and to provide for the equitable treatment of all Government officers and employees under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Post Office and Civil Service, House Administration, Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Rules.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 2338. A bill requiring the National Science Foundation to submit to the Congress a report concerning science and mathematics education and career potential for the underprivileged; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WHITTAKER (by request):

H.R. 2339. A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to authorize the imposition of rail safety user fees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2340. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to dismiss frivolous administrative appeals of decisions made by the Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 2341. A bill to amend section 21 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1989, and October 16, 1990, as "World Food Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FISH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COURTER, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTERT,

Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JAMES, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KYL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MC EWEN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PARRIS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RAY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SARPALIS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.J. Res. 268. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSTAMANTE (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr.

PICKLE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. SARPALIS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. DE LA GARZA):

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution honoring the Texas-Israel Exchange program for its contributions to the agricultural interests of Texas and Israel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. BATES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. SPRATT):

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution recommending that the Department of Energy take immediate action to determine validity and potential to the Nation's energy needs of recent cold fusion experiments that may create energy from nuclear fusion and that the Department also make recommendations to the Congress regarding future nuclear fusion programs; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

82. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to the ICC oversight of Maine railroads; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

83. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to the construction of a natural gas pipeline between Canada and the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

84. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to improved roads on the Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

85. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to the Wailua sewage treatment plant expansion project; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

86. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to air service subsidy for the city of Valdez; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 140: Mr. WISE, Mr. PEPPER, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. PERKINS.

H.R. 211: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 214: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 215: Mr. WELDON and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 237: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 286: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 368: Mr. CONTE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT.

H.R. 369: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PENNY, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 371: Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 401: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 543: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 586: Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H.R. 736: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 762: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. RHODES, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 799: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado and Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 806: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 895: Mr. WEBER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 901: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. MCCREY.

H.R. 980: Mr. FRANK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. TALLON, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DYSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 982: Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 1030: Mr. GAYDOS.

H.R. 1068: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 1074: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1083: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. RITTER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 1141: Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 1206: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1243: Mr. HILER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SABO, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WISE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1406: Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 1416: Mr. HILER, Mr. McDade, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. KYL, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 1457: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. HERTTEL, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1493: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1648: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PENNY, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1658: Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 1679: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1757: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1957: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROGERS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RAY, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 2022: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PORTER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 2051: Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 2055: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 2098: Mr. FROST, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MFUME, Mr. UPTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. DICKS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RAY, Mr. GRANT, and Mr. McDade.

H.R. 2145: Mr. MRAZEK and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 2191: Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2217: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2273: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GRAY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. WALGREN.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RUSSO, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.J. Res. 147: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 168: Mr. DEWINE.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. FISH, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RAY, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.J. Res. 185: Mr. HATCHER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FISH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DYSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EARLY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, and Mr. DEWINE.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. McDade, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. APLEGATE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CONTE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WISE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. OLIN, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. FLAKE.

H. Res. 104: Mr. WISE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WEISS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Res. 141: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. GRANT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. PARKER.

